DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 301 EA 015 385

AUTHOR	Keesling, J. Ward
TITLE	Parents and Federal Education Programs: Preliminary Findings from the Study of Parental Involvement.
INSTITUTION	System Development Corp., Santa Monica, Calif. Studies and Evaluation Dept.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	TM-6974/002/00
PUB DATE	Dec 80
CONTRACT	300-78-0437
NOTE	254p.; For related documents, see ED 218 783-789 and ED 219 851.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Compliance (Legal); Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; Federal Regulation; Governance; Government School Relationship; Instruction; National Surveys; *Parent Participation; Parent Role; *Parent School Relationship; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VI; Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII; Project Follow Through

ABSTRACT

This report provides some initial findings from the "Study of Parental Involvement in Four Federal Education Programs." The four programs concerned are Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, ESEA Title VI, ESEA Title VII, and Project Follow Through. This report describes parental involvement in these programs and identifies some factors contributing to parental involvement, without attempting to evaluate the parental involvement components of the programs or to reveal the values of, or the specific forms taken by, parental involvement. The main conclusion of the report, based on the 1979 Federal Programs Survey of project officers in a nationally representative sample of districts and schools, is that legislation and regulation can provide powerful motivation for the fostering and support of parental involvement. Secondary conclusions are that funding levels influence the extent of parental involvement activities and that the extent to which districts implement mandated activities should be monitored. The report presents historical background material, study objectives and methodology, survey design, and findings concerning four aspects of each of the four programs: the extent of parental involvement in governance and in provision of educational offerings, and the coordination and financing of parental involvement activities. (Author/PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED225301

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Parents and Federal Education Programs: Preliminary Findings

EA 015 385

The Study of Parental Involvement

PARENTS AND FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS: PRELIMINARY FINDINGS FROM THE STUDY OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

J. WARD KEESLING

System Development Corporation
Santa Monica, California

December 1980

TM-6974/002/00

The research reported here was conducted by System Development Corporation under Contract HEW 300-78-0437 with the United States Department of Education. Views or conclusions contained in this report should not be interpreted as representing the official opinion or policy of the Department of Education.

PROJECT OFFICER, CONSULTANTS AND RESOURCE PERSONS, PROJECT PERSONNEL

Project Officer

Gerald Burns

Former Project Officer

D. G. Ozenne

Consultants and Resource Persons

John Alden
Imani Bennett-Woodruff
Marta Bequer
Carlota Texidor del Portillo
Edgar Epps
Marilyn Gittell
Warren Griffin
Roger Jackson
Suzanne Jackson
Velma James
Joseph H. Kosai
Rose Koury
Patricia Lamphear
Robert Lee Linn
Manuel Nieto
Enrique Perez
Raymond Rist
Riley Simmons
Seymour Sudman
Treopia G. Washington

Project Co-Directors

J. Ward Keesling
Ralph J. Melaragno

Project Secretaries

Julie Smith
Suzann Stahl

Former Project Staff

Raymond B. Stewart,
Former SDC Project Director
Hilda Borko
Sally Hanes

Project Staff

Raquel Cadena-Munoz
Diana Dingler
Peggy Lyons
Al Robbins
Allen Smith
Maxine Sparks

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank several people formerly associated with this study who assisted with the Federal Programs Survey phase: Daniel G. Ozenne who provided much needed support from the former Office of Evaluation and Dissemination; Raymond B. Stewart who managed the study during this phase of work; and Sally Hanes who built and maintained the data bases used in this report. Special thanks are due to the respondents whose time was essential to the completion of this report.

This study is somewhat unique in that offices of four different federally sponsored education programs have been involved in the process of defining the research issues, developing instruments, and reviewing reports. The present Project Officer, Gerald Burns, has been instrumental in guiding this report through the four federal offices during the review process. His background in Follow Through also provided some unique insights into the parental involvement components of this program.

Other members of the staff, past and present, as well as the consultants and resource persons listed earlier, contributed many valuable insights to the cycles of review and revision. Among these, Ralph Melaragno's contributions to the formulation of policy issues and research questions (in Working Paper 1) were especially valuable.

Julie Smith and Suzann Stahl typed several drafts of the manuscript. Anne Hall supervised the production of the final draft.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
LIST OF TABLES		v
OVERVIEW AND SUMMARY		vii
CHAPTER I.	INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II.	THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION'S STUDY OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN FOUR FEDERAL PROGRAMS	7
CHAPTER III.	OVERVIEW OF THE FEDERAL PROGRAMS SURVEY	14
CHAPTER IV.	PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN PROGRAMS FUNDED BY TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT	23
CHAPTER V.	PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN PROGRAMS FUNDED BY THE EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID ACT (ESAA)	44
CHAPTER VI.	PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN PROGRAMS FUNDED BY TITLE VII OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT	62
CHAPTER VII.	PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN PROGRAMS FUNDED BY FOLLOW THROUGH	79
CHAPTER VIII.	A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN FOUR FEDERAL PROGRAMS	99
REFERENCES		117
APPENDIX A		119

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1.	Correspondence Between the Conceptual Framework and the Content of Questionnaires Used in the Federal Programs Survey	19
Table 2.	Progress of the Title I Sample	26
Table 3.	Title I-Served Schools Classified as to Urban or Rural Location	29
Table 4.	Estimated Percentages of Schools Served by Title I and by Other Specific Federal Programs	29
Table 5.	Level of Authority of Title I District-Level PACs in Various Management Activities	33
Table 6.	Level of Authority of Title I School-Level PACs in Various Management Activities	37
Table 7.	Progress of the ESAA Sample	46
Table 8.	ESAA-Served Schools Classified as to Urban or Rural Location	48
Table 9.	Estimated Percentages of Schools Served by ESAA and by Other Specific Federal Programs	49
Table 10.	Level of Authority of ESAA DACs in Various Management Activities	53
Table 11.	Progress of the Title VII Sample	64
Table 12.	Title VII-Served Schools Classified as to Urban or Rural Location	66
Table 13.	Estimated Percentages of Schools Served by Title VII and by Other Specific Federal Programs	66
Table 14.	Level of Authority of Title VII District-Level CACs in Various Management Activities	70
Table 15.	Progress of the Follow Through Sample	82

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

		Page
Table 16.	Follow Through-Served Schools Classified as to Urban or Rural Location	85
Table 17.	Estimated Percentages of Schools Served by Follow Through and other Specific Federal Programs	85
Table 18.	Level of Authority of Follow Through PACs in Various Management Activities	90
Table 19.	Distribution of Schools by Program and Locale	100
Table 20.	Average Indicators of Project Size and Funding Levels, by Program	101
Table 21.	Characteristics of District-Level Advisory Committees, by Program	104
Table 22.	Participation of District-Level Advisory Committees in Various Management Activities, by Program	106
Table 23.	District-Level and School-Level Provisions for Coordination of Parental Involvement Activities, by Program	109
Table 24.	Parent Participation in the Educational Function, by Program	111

OVERVIEW AND SUMMARY

This report provides some initial findings from the Study of Parental Involvement in Four Federal Education Programs (hereafter, the Study of Parental Involvement), which is being conducted by System Development Corporation (SDC) under a contract with the U.S. Department of Education (ED). The present study is concerned with four federally funded educational programs:

- Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which provides "financial assistance... to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families... (to meet) the special educational needs of educationally deprived children."

- Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, also called the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA), which provides "financial assistance to meet the special needs incident to the elimination of minority group segregation and discrimination among students and faculty... and to encourage the voluntary elimination, reduction, or prevention of minority group isolation (in schools)...."

- Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, also called the Bilingual Education Act, which provides "financial assistance to local educational agencies... to enable (them)... to demonstrate effective ways of providing, for children of limited English proficiency, instruction designed to enable them, while using their native language, to achieve competence in the English language."

- Follow Through, enabled as part of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, provides funds to support "comprehensive educational, health, nutritional, social, and other services as will aid in the continued development of children (from low-income families)... to their full potential."

These four programs were selected by the Department of Education for inclusion in the study because they address different educational concerns, serve different student populations, and have different legislative and regulatory requirements for parental participation. The cross-section of parental involvement incorporated in the study offers opportunities for more revealing policy analyses than would be possible in a study of any one of the programs by itself.

The Study of Parental Involvement was designed to carry out six major tasks:

1. Describe parental involvement in the four programs.

2. Identify contributory factors (factors that facilitate or inhibit parental involvement).

3. Determine the consequences of parental involvement.

4. Specify models of parental involvement.

5. Promulgate findings.

6. Validate the models of parental involvement (presently an optional activity).

This report covers the first task and part of the second. The description of involvement presented in this report is based on the Federal Programs Survey of project officers in a nationally representative sample of districts and schools that was carried out in the spring of 1979.

All four programs are subject to cycles of legislative reauthorization and rewriting of regulations. At the time of the survey the Follow Through program was the only one of the four to have approved regulations. These regulations elaborate considerably on the legislation with respect to parental involvement.

Amendatory legislation for the other programs was enacted in October of 1978, (before the Federal Programs Survey), but regulations had not been approved by the time this report was written. Generally speaking, the proposed regulations for these three programs do not elaborate on the legislation with respect to parental involvement.

It is important to note that the findings reported in this volume should not be construed as a comparative evaluation of parental involvement components across programs. Nor are they to be construed as a compliance audit. There are very few specific statements in the legislation or regulations that would permit one to construct a standard by which to assess the implementation of parental involvement components by districts and schools. There are even fewer instances where the legislation or regulations are identical across programs and would permit a valid comparison of their parental involvement components.

The findings presented in this report are not intended to reveal the value of parental involvement to the districts, schools, teachers, parents or children. The findings are a portrayal of the formal aspects of parental involvement components in the spring of 1979. They provide a background on the extent of various types of parental involvement activities that will be useful in interpreting the richer data on the nature and value of these activities in subsequent reports from the study.

OVERALL SUMMARY

The main conclusion of the study may be summarized in one succinct statement:

- Legislation and regulation can provide a powerful motivation to foster and support parental involvement.

The data support the inference that differences between programs in the nature and extent of parental involvement are related to differences in the content of the legislation and regulations defining the programs. The data reveal

that the specific content of the legislation and regulations influences the activities undertaken in the name of parental involvement at project sites.

There are two secondary conclusions:

- The level of funding influences the extent of parental involvement activities.
- It is important to monitor the extent to which districts implement mandated activities.

Comparisons across programs reveal that the level of funding (on a per-pupil basis) influenced the availabilty of funds to provide certain services and activities related to parental involvement. However, the data were not sufficiently clear or specific to permit an accurate estimation of the costs of these services and activities.

While the survey did not inquire about monitoring practices, certain features of the data indicate that some monitoring of the implementation of required activities is desirable.

DISCUSSION

Legislation and regulation can influence parental involvement by:

- Emphasizing parental involvement in the choice of language used to express the legislative or regulatory intent.
- Specifying the activities in which parents are to engage.
- Providing incentives for obtaining participation of parents.

It is difficult to discuss these influences separately because they tend to occur together (or not at all) in the legislation and regulations.

Nevertheless, in the following section each of the three types of influence mentioned above will be illustrated by contrasting the legislation and regulations for the programs and then examining relevant data from the survey.

EMPHASIS ON INVOLVEMENT

Each of the four programs mandates that each participating district must establish an advisory committee for the local project, of which the majority of members should be parents of served children. The language used to describe the function of this group is very different from program to program, however:

- Follow Through regulations state that the advisory committees are to "assist with the planning and operation of project activities and to actively participate in decision making concerning these activities."

- ESAA legislation indicates that projects should "be operated in consultation with, and with the involvement of" the advisory committee.

- Title VII legislation states that projects should "provide for the continuing consultation with, and participation by" the advisory committee.

- Title I legislation states that advisory committees should have "responsibility for advising (the district) in planning for, and implementation and evaluation of, its . . . (Title I) projects."

The language of the Follow Through regulations is the most emphatic about the role of the advisory committee in describing the general function of this group. The language of the Title I legislation is the least emphatic.

The legislation for ESAA and Title VII are equal in their emphasis of the committee's role and fall somewhere between the levels of emphasis represented by the Title I and Follow Through language.

The survey inquired about who was responsible for conducting the meetings of the advisory group and for setting the agenda. Neither of these issues is specifically addressed in the legislation or regulations for the four programs under study. However, these indicators should be sensitive to the different emphases on involvement across the programs. The survey data revealed that meetings of 85 percent of the advisory committees for Follow Through projects were run by a committee member (rather than a project staff member). Eighty-three percent of these committees used agendas set by committee members (often in consultation with district personnel). By contrast, meetings of almost one-half of the Title I advisory committees are conducted by a project staff member. Just over 65 percent of these committees used agendas that were set by committee members (often in consultation with district personnel). Data for the ESAA and Title VII programs fell between these two extremes, except that it was estimated that 91 percent of Title VII advisory committees used agendas set by committee members (again, often in consultation with district personnel). However, meetings of only 58 percent of the Title VII committees were chaired by an advisory committee member. These data are generally consistent with the level of emphasis on advisory committee involvement found in the legislation and regulations.

SPECIFYING ACTIVITIES

There are a few instances of language in the legislation and regulations governing these programs that mandates specific activities for parents. One of the best examples is the Title I mandate that schools having more than 40 served pupils should have a school-level advisory committee of which the majority of members should be parents of served children. None of the other three programs mandates school-level advisory groups.

The survey data indicated that 88 percent of the Title I-served schools having 40 or more served pupils had a school-level advisory committee. Schools served by the other programs were less likely to have school-level advisory groups: 70 percent of Follow Through-served schools had an advisory group,

while about 40 percent of Title VII-served schools and 32 percent of ESAA-served schools had advisory groups for those projects.

In the previous section, the emphatic nature of the regulatory language describing the general role of the advisory committee in Follow Through projects was presented. In addition, these regulations also enumerate nine specific duties for the advisory committees to carry out, including the following management activities: helping to develop all components of the project proposal, approving the project proposal in its final form, helping to develop criteria for selecting professional staff and recommending the selection of such staff, and exercising the primary responsibility in recommending the selection of paraprofessional staff. None of the other programs is this specific about the role of the advisory committee.

The survey inquired about the level of decision-making authority exercised by the advisory committees in each of several management activities. The most pertinent examples to illustrate the effects of the specific language cited above come from the area of parental involvement in selection of personnel. Ninety-seven percent of Follow Through advisory committees have at least an advisory role in selecting project paraprofessionals, while in Title I the corresponding percentage is 21, in Title VII it is 32 and in ESAA it is 47. Furthermore, 86 percent of Follow Through advisory committees have at least an advisory role in selecting project professionals, while in Title I the corresponding percentage is 28, in Title VII it is 38 and in ESAA it is 43.

These data are consistent with the hypothesis that specificity of the regulatory and legislative language makes a difference in the activities in which parents engage.

A final example will illustrate the effects of specificity of language on project budgets related to parental involvement. Follow Through is the only program of the four that mentions a budget for the advisory committee. The regulations state that it must be "sufficient to allow (the committee) to

effectively fulfill its responsibilities." Again, this specific language results in a considerable difference in the proportion of advisory committees with budgets: 98 percent in Follow Through, 49 percent in Title VII, 42 percent in Title I, and 30 percent in ESAA.

Clearly, it cannot be inferred that all of the differences among these programs are the result of differences in the specific language of legislation or regulation. Even when the legislation or regulations offer no guidelines, there are still differences among the programs (reflecting other influences on parental involvement that were not examined in this phase of the study). However, it does appear that mandating certain activities can have a very large effect on parental involvement.

INCENTIVES FOR INVOLVEMENT

Incentives for parental involvement are offered to districts only by the Follow Through program. These take two forms: 1) A statement in the regulations indicates that continued funding of each project is contingent to some degree on demonstrations that parents are involved as paraprofessionals and volunteers and that the project advisory committee does have the responsibilities described in the regulations; 2) A provision in the regulations allows certain in-kind contributions (such as volunteer time) to be counted in place of cash in paying the non-federal share of the cost of the project (up to 20 percent of the cost must be borne by the district).

Combining the first incentive with specific language directing that in fulfilling paraprofessional staff positions "the highest priority will be accorded to low-income persons who are parents of Follow Through children," results in much larger proportions of Follow Through parents holding these positions than parents of children served by other programs. Seventy-four percent of Follow Through-served schools employ parents of served children as paid paraprofessionals. The corresponding figures in the other programs were: 9 percent in Title I, 14 percent in ESAA and 18 percent in Title VII.

Combining the second incentive with language directing that low-income parents of Follow Through children be given highest priority in filling volunteer positions also results in higher percentages of schools with volunteer programs. Sixty-seven percent of Follow Through-served schools had a volunteer program, while 32 percent of Title VII-served schools, 18 percent of ESAA-served schools and 16 percent of Title 1-served schools had such programs.

The data do not permit an assessment of the individual effects on parental involvement of emphasis, specificity or incentives in the legislative or regulatory language. The conclusion is drawn that all three are important and work best in combination with one another.

MONITORING ACTIVITIES

Specifying, in legislation and regulation, that certain activities should take place within local projects probably does not guarantee that they will take place. The Follow Through regulations are not only specific as to the nature of the parental involvement activities they wish to foster, they also state a requirement for evidence of implementation as a condition of continued funding. There is evidence in the data that legislative or regulatory intent is not uniformly fulfilled by the projects supported by these programs. A clear example of this is that some districts in all programs but Follow Through reported not having the required advisory committee.

The study did not address the mechanisms that programs use to monitor the implementation of the legislative or regulatory mandates, so no conclusion can be drawn beyond the apparent need to seek evidence of compliance.

LEVEL OF FUNDING

It was estimated that Follow Through and Title I projects spent about $500 per served student per year, on average. Title VII projects spent about 65 percent of this amount and ESAA projects spent about 50 percent. It was

estimated that 98 percent of Follow Through-served schools were also receiving Title I funds. The implication of this is that Follow Through projects have more resources available to expend on intensive parental involvement. As evidence of this, the survey data indicated that 92 percent of Follow Through projects provided some form of parent coordination at the project-level while the corresponding figures were 83 percent of Title VII projects, 78 percent of ESAA projects and 62 percent of Title I projects. Differences in the provision of school-level parent coordination services was even more dramatic: the corresponding figures were 81 percent in Follow Through, 48 percent in Title VII, 36 percent in ESAA and 35 percent in Title I. It is difficult to conclude that Follow Through projects would have provided these parent coordination services in the absence of the emphatic, specific and incentive-rich regulatory language cited earlier. On the other hand, they may not have been able to provide these services without the availability of additional resources apparent in the per-pupil funding figures. (It should be noted that the Follow Through budget was cut by 31 percent in the 1980-1981 school year.)

CONCLUSIONS

It bears repeating that the four programs under study have different purposes and goals. The legislation and regulations for each program attempt to assure a role for parents in the context of that program's intent. Presumably, each program office believes that the roles it allocates to parents advance the goals of the program. The historical origins of the Follow Through program have led it to emphasize parental involvement as one means to mobilize and coordinate community resources for the benefit of children. The other programs, not sharing these historical antecedents, may have felt uncomfortable with specifying additional parental involvement components (and requiring evidence of compliance) unless there was compelling reason to believe that these components would advance the main purposes of the program.

Within the context of each program, the value of emphasizing parental involvement has to be weighed against the values assigned to other components demanding support, especially the provision of instructional services. The data

from this study indicate that the level of parental involvement could be increased if:

- The legislation and regulations defining the program emphasized parental involvement, specified the desired forms of involvement, and provided incentives for involvement.

- Funding was provided for the specified activities, especially for mandated advisory committees and for parent coordinators.

- Some form of monitoring the implementation of specified activities was provided.

The data from this study also indicate that project managers at the local level generally do attempt to implement the mandated parental involvement components, going beyond the mandate to add other activities that seem suitable in the local context. These additional activities are chosen to promote the goals of the local project. It is worth observing that there are projects in all programs that reported broad and intense involvement of parents in the management and operation of the project activities. This suggests that there may be ways in which parental involvement can be an effective force in achieving the goals of each of the programs.

The subsequent phases of the Study of Parental Involvement will probe more deeply for the factors contributing to and the outcomes resulting from parental involvement in these four programs. Describing the relationship among the functions of parental involvement and their joint relationship to programmatic goals is the objective of the next phase of the study.

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

This report provides some initial findings from the Study of Parental Involvement in Four Federal Education Programs (hereafter, the Study of Parental Involvement), which is being conducted by System Development Corporation (SDC) under a contract with the U.S. Department of Education (ED). This chapter presents a brief overview of the history of parental involvement in federally sponsored programs and the study of such involvement, followed by a precis of the present study and this report.

Throughout this presentation, it should be understood that the present study is concerned with only four federally funded educational programs: Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title VII of the same act, The Emergency School Aid Act, and Follow Through. While the presentation of certain information concerns a broader range of programs, the specific focus of this study has led to a concentration on the four programs mentioned above.

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN FEDERAL PROGRAMS

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The concept of parental involvement in federal education programs can be traced back to the Community Action Program of the Economic Opportunity Act (EOA) of 1964, administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). Peterson and Greenstone (1977) indicate that EOA included community action to increase the political participation of previously excluded citizens, particularly members of ethnic minority groups. They note, "Taking its authority from EOA's celebrated requirement that poverty programs be developed with the 'maximum feasible participation of the residents of areas and the members of the groups served,' the OEO insisted that approximately one-third of local policy making bodies consist of such residents or members, chosen 'whenever feasible' in accordance with democratic procedures." Citizen participation in federal programs began in earnest with the EOA, based on the principle of

participatory democracy: affected citizens have the right to participate in the formation of policies and the making of decisions that may affect their lives.

In terms of education, the Head Start program of EOA addressed the "maximum feasible participation" requirement by including parents of children being served on policy making groups. In addition, parents of Head Start children were employed as staff members in Head Start centers, and center personnel had frequent contact with parents at the center and in the home. Head Start has provided a paradigm for parental involvement in federal educational programs created subsequently.

Close on the heels of EOA came the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. Seen by many as a continuation of the War on Poverty (Levin, 1977), ESEA broke the long tradition of opposition to federal support for public schools and gave the Commissioner of Education authority to establish basic criteria for implementation. Among the then-Commissioner's criteria was the requirement that parents be involved in developing local project applications for Title I of the Act.

The Title VII Bilingual Program and Emergency School Aid Act program were designed by Congress to provide LEAs with assistance for unique problems. Since each was conceived of by Congress as a district-level program, the "participatory democracy" principle caused Congress to require district-level advisory groups.

The legislation for Follow Through, as regards parental involvement, was modeled closely after that for Head Start. The Community Services Act funded Follow Through in OEO, although administrative control resided in the U.S. Office of Education. (This has since changed, and Follow Through is now funded through USED.) Given its ancestry in OEO, it is not surprising that the legislation and guidelines for Follow Through specify a great deal about parental involvement.

PRIOR RESEARCH ON PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

While prior evaluations of each of the four subject programs have included some attention to parental involvement, none has addressed it in a substantial way. Therefore, little is presently known about all aspects of parental involvement in these four programs. Prior research results related to each of the four programs are reported in the section devoted to that program; see Chapters IV-VII.

Parent involvement has also been studied in work that is not directly tied to evaluations of federal programs. Three recent reviews are available that summarize findings from different studies (Chong, 1976; Center for Equal Education, 1977; Gordon, 1978). From these reviews it appears that parental participation in the classroom, parental assistance to their own children at home, and home visits by school-community liaison personnel result in an improved classroom atmosphere and in both cognitive and affective growth on the part of the students. These reviews also suggest that the involvement of parent advisory groups does not appear to have had a great impact on schools and students, and that more extensive research is required in order to develop a theory of parental participation in decision making that would aid in the evaluation and formulation of policy in this area. These reviews have helped shape our study, but the narrow focus for each of the above studies requires that findings be verified or rejected through detailed examinations of the four federal programs before policy decisions can be made.

THE STUDY OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN FOUR FEDERAL PROGRAMS

NATURE OF THE STUDY

The Study of Parental Involvement is examining the role of parents in four educational programs offered by ED: Title I and Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Follow Through, and the Emergency School Aid Act. These four programs were selected by the Department of Education for inclusion in the study because they address different educational concerns, serve

different student populations, and have different legislative and regulatory requirements for parental participation. The cross-section of parental involvement incorporated in the study offers opportunities for more revealing policy analyses than would be possible in a study of any one of the programs by itself.

Briefly, the study is intended to describe the ways in which parents are involved in each program, the factors that contribute to parental involvement, and the outcomes of parental involvement activities. Further, the study is to determine effective models of parental involvement.

To achieve these objectives, three separate substudies are being carried out. One, a national survey of school districts and schools participating in one or more of the four federal programs, produced factual information on formal aspects of parental involvement (this is called the Federal Programs Survey). Certain of the information collected during the survey is presented in this volume. The second substudy involves an in-depth look at a subset of the districts and schools, studying both formal and informal dimensions of parental involvement (this is called the Site Study). The third substudy (presently optional) will examine the validity of parental involvement models derived from the second substudy.

CONTENT OF THIS REPORT

The second chapter of this report contains details on the Study of Parental Involvement. Specifically, it presents the study objectives, a conceptualization of parental involvement that was developed to guide the research, the methodology we are following to reach the study objectives, and the products that will ensue from the study.

The third chapter describes the overall design for and conduct of the Federal Programs Survey. This chapter provides the background needed to understand the chapters on each program, which follow.

Each of the next four chapters presents findings on one of the four programs, including: The nature of the program, the development of the parental involvement component within the program, the prior research findings on parental involvement in the program, and the findings of The Federal Programs Survey.

In this report findings are presented in the following four areas:

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN PROJECT GOVERNANCE

Data related to this topic are concerned with parental participation in district-level, (project-level for Follow Through) and school-level advisory groups. Information is presented on the membership of such groups, the conduct of the group's meetings, and management activities of the groups.

COORDINATION OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Data within this category are concerned with the extent to which coordinators of parental involvement activities are found at the district and the school levels, and the nature of their activities.

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN PROJECT EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS

This set of data focuses on three different ways parents can participate in the project's educational endeavors: as paid paraprofessionals, as volunteers, and as teachers of their own children at home.

FINANCING OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

Within this category information is presented on the extent to which districts have line items for parental involvement activities, and the types of activities on which such funds are spent.

The results from the Federal Programs Survey have been deliberately placed in four separate sections--one for each program. This was done to emphasize the

fact that the four programs serve different purposes and have different goals. A brief chapter is devoted to a comparison of the programs intended to indicate the influence of legislation and guidelines on the nature and magnitude of parental involvement in these programs.

It is important to note that the findings reported in this volume should not be construed as a comparative evaluation of parental involvement components across programs. Nor are they to be construed as a compliance audit. There are very few specific statements in the legislation or regulations that would permit one to construct a standard by which to assess the implementation of parental involvement components by districts and schools. There are even fewer instances where the legislation or regulations are identical across programs and would permit a valid comparison of their parental involvement components.

The findings presented in this report are not intended to reveal the value of parental involvement to the districts, schools, teachers, parents or children. The findings are a portrayal of the formal aspects of parental involvement components in the spring of 1979. They provide a background on the extent of various types of parental involvement activities that will be useful in interpreting the richer data on the nature and value of these activities in subsequent reports from the study.

CHAPTER II. THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION'S STUDY OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN FOUR FEDERAL PROGRAMS

This chapter presents the objectives of the study, the conceptualization of parental involvement that guides the study, the methodology of the study and the products to issue from the study.

As has been described previously, there is a growing interest in the inclusion of citizens in social programs that affect their lives. But as the review of previous research indicates, little is now known of a concrete nature regarding the participation of parents in educational programs. In order to specify the policy issues and research questions, several activities were undertaken. Books, papers, and reports on parents in the educational process were collected and reviewed. Parents, members of organizations with special interests in parental involvement, Department of Education personnel from the four programs in the study, and Congressional staff members were interviewed. The Policy Advisory Group for this study met and considered the results of these activities and provided direction for the production of Working Paper No. 1: Policy-Relevant Issues and Research Questions, published in October of 1979. This paper provides, in detail, the scope of the issues and questions to be addressed over the entire course of the study.

There are three primary audiences for the study: Congress, because of its growing interest in legislation regarding parental participation; program administrators, in the Department of Education, who must see that Congress' intentions are carried out; and project implementers, who design and carry out local projects with parental involvement components. In addition, educational researchers studying parental involvement will find the study's findings valuable when planning and conducting future investigations.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

There are six major objectives for the study.

1. Describe Parental Involvement

The first objective is to provide detailed descriptions of parental involvement in terms of three caregories of information:

a. Types and levels of parental involvement activities, and the extent to which each activity occurs.

b. Characteristics of participants and non-participants in parental involvement activities, including both parents and educators.

c. Costs associated with parental involvement activities.

2. Identify Contributory Factors

As part of the study, factors will be identified that facilitate the conduct of parental involvement activities, along with factors that inhibit such activities. In addition, an attempt will be made to ascertain the relative contributions of different factors to both specific activities and to parental involvement in general.

3. Determine Consequences

The third study objective is to determine the direction and degree of the outcomes of parental involvement activities. Included in this task are outcomes of specific activities as well as outcomes of parental involvement in general.

4. Specify Models

Based on findings concerning parental involvement activities and their outcomes, the characteristics of model programs of parental involvement will be specified in terms of combinations of activities that are found to be effective.

5. Promulgate Findings

Reports and handbooks will be produced to provide information on parental involvement for each of the target audiences for the study. These documents will be tailored to meet the needs of each audience.

6. Validate Models

The sixth objective covers the validation of the exemplary models. A specific substudy will be designed to determine whether the identified models are valid for other types of outcomes and/or in other contexts.

A CONCEPTUALIZATION OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

In order to realize the objectives of the study a conceptualization of parental involvement was developed. It can be summarized by the statement:

> Given that certain preconditions are satisfied, parental involvement functions are implemented in varying ways, which depend upon particular contextual factors, and which produce certain outcomes.

Five major elements are embedded in this statement. These comprise the conceptualization that guides the study, and are outlined briefly below.

FUNCTIONS

An examination of contemporary thinking about parental involvement led to an identification of five parental involvement functions. These are:

a. Parental participation in project governance (primarily defined as decision making).

b. Parental participation in the education of students (as instructional paraprofessionals, or volunteers, or as teachers of their own children at home).

c. Parental support for the school.

d. Communication and interpersonal relations among parents and educators.

e. Educational offerings provided for the benefit of parents.

These functions are consistent with earlier formulations by Stearns and Peterson (1973), Gordon, Olmstead, Rubin and True (1979). The Study of Parental Involvement in Federal Programs will concentrate on the governance and educational functions to a greater degree than on the other three functions, since those two functions are the most closely related to the purposes of the four federal programs.

PRECONDITIONS

These are the conditions that must be satisfied in order for parental involvement activities to take place. They are necessary for the implementation of a function, in that a function cannot exist if any of the preconditions is not met. For instance, one precondition is that there be some parents willing to engage in a function.

CONTEXT

Parental involvement activities take place within an environment, which contributes to the manner and degree of their operationalization and potentially to their effectiveness. Systematic examinations of these contextual factors

may allow for a determination of which ones contribute to parental involvement, in what ways, and to what degrees. As an example, a critical contextual factor is a community's history of citizen involvement with social programs.

IMPLEMENTATION

When a particular parental involvement function is carried out, there are a number of variables that help portray the process of implementation. Through these variables, activities can be described in terms of participants, levels of participation, and costs. Two variables that exemplify this element are the characteristics of participating parents and of non-participating parents.

OUTCOMES

Parental involvement activities can lead to both positive and negative consequences, for both institutions and individuals. Examinations of these outcomes will provide the information needed for decisions about what constitutes effective parental involvement practices. We will examine such outcomes as the impact parents have on the provisions of services to students, and changes in parents' attitudes toward education.

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

With the conceptual framework as a backdrop, three substudies have been designed to provide the answers for the research questions and policy issues inherent in the study objectives. Each is summarized below.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS SURVEY

Given the present paucity of information regarding parental involvement in the four programs, there is a need for basic descriptive data on formal parental involvement activities collected from a sample of districts and schools that is nationally representative. To this end a sample of districts and schools was selected for participation in a survey. District-level program personnel

were the primary respondents. Data of a factual nature were collected on funding arrangements; parent advisory groups; parents as paid aides, volunteers, and teachers of their own children at home; and the supervision and coordination of parental involvement. The data collection effort for the national survey was carried out in spring, 1979. This report concerns the findings of this national survey, which are presented in Chapters IV through VII.

SITE STUDY

At the present time it is not possible to specify unequivocally the forces that help or hinder parental involvement, nor the outcomes of parental involvement activities. Further, certain types of parental involvement activities are highly informal, and all activities are likely to have many subtle but critical nuances. These dimensions of parental involvement are not amenable to study on the basis of information collected through survey methodology.

Determining contributory factors, consequences, and subtleties of parental involvement activities--all call for intensive investigation by on-site researchers, with the investigation tailored in part to the unique aspects of each location. This has been accomplished during the Site Study which was conducted in the first half of 1980. The findings from the Site Study will be presented in The Descriptive Report, as indicated below.

VALIDATION STUDY

In the third substudy, exemplary models identified during the Site Study will be evaluated. The primary mission of this substudy will be to determine the validity of hypothesized models, along with their ability to be implemented in different contexts. Since the models have not yet been identified. the precise design for the Validation Study remains to be determined.

PRODUCTS OF THE STUDY OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

The primary products of the study are the reports described below.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS SURVEY

The report on the Federal Programs Survey will be a comprehensive description of the current status of formal parental involvement practices in districts and schools receiving federal funds under one or more of the subject programs. This volume is the report on the Federal Programs Survey.

DESCRIPTIVE REPORT

The descriptive report will draw upon data from both the Site Study and the Federal Programs Survey. The Site Study information will provide the depth for a comprehensive treatment of parental involvement activities, the factors that contribute to those activities, and the consequences of parental involvement The FPS data will be used to provide nationwide estimates of characteristics of parental involvement that the Site Study findings reveal to be important. This report also will include a technical section that will summarize the findings of the study, describe the details of the methodologies employed, and present information to support reanalysis efforts and the design of additional studies dealing with parental involvement.

HANDBOOKS

A particularly critical product of the study will be a set of handbooks on the conduct of parental involvement that will be prepared for parents and project-level personnel. While it may be possible to prepare a single handbook with universal utility, it is anticipated that a more fruitful approach will be to prepare separate handbooks for each of the four programs--handbooks that reflect the special flavor of each program.

CHAPTER III. OVERVIEW OF THE FEDERAL PROGRAMS SURVEY

Each of the chapters on a specific program gives the details on the survey of that program. This chapter provides a general overview of the survey design.

SAMPLE DESIGN

The sample for each program was designed to obtain a self-weighting, random sample of participating schools. Because nationwide lists of participating schools could not be generated in a timely fashion, it was decided to sample participating districts first, then sample schools from lists of participating schools to be obtained from the sampled districts.

Many of the characteristics of interest in the study involve district-level activities (e.g., the district-level advisory group). In order to estimate values representing national averages it was necessary to have many districts participate in the survey. However, it was also desirable to have at least two participating schools in each sampled district so that school-to-school variation within districts could be examined, and so that there would be two schools to study in each district that was chosen for participation in the Site Study phase. Preliminary work indicated that a sample of about 100 districts per program would provide a sufficient basis for reasonably precise estimates of district-level population values. At the school level it was determined that a sample of about 250 per program could be drawn within the budget constraints. This would provide for two or more schools to be drawn in each of the sampled districts.

The size of the sample to be drawn for each program was determined by allocating districts such that the hypothetical sampling errors were equal across programs. Thus, the sample sizes reflected the different sizes of the programs: Title I has the largest sample and Follow Through the smallest. But both samples yield the same estimated sampling error.

Samples of districts were drawn independently for each program using a technique known as probability proportional to size (PPS) sampling. The total district enrollment in grades K-8 was used as the size measure. This insured that larger districts with more served schools would come into the sample with higher probability than smaller districts. This tended to insure that districts with a sufficiently large number of served schools (for there to be two or more picked) would appear in the sample. It also made the sampling more efficient because fewer lists of participating schools had to be requested. Lists of the served schools were obtained from the sampled districts and samples were drawn from this list with each school having a probability of being drawn proportional to the reciprocal of the size measure (enrollment) used to draw its district. With no other constraints, this would have produced the equivalent of a simple random sample of schools in each program. However, in order to minimize the burden on the respondent within a district (usually the district-level program director), it was decided to sample no more than four schools per district. Schools were randomly discarded within the sampled districts with more than four sampled schools to bring the number of sampled schools down to four. In order to reach the goal of 2.5 schools per district (on the average), the initial sample size was increased to more than 2.5 schools per district (for each program, as necessary) to allow for losses due to the process of discarding schools in districts where more than four schools were drawn into the sample. In practice, this meant redrawing the school sample about three times (for each program) in order to achieve a proper balance between the initial over-sample and subsequent deletions.

Another consequence of the goal of approximating a simple random sample of schools was that schools within large school districts were given fewer chances of being selected into the school sample in order to compensate for the fact that these districts had had greater likelihood of selection into the district sample. In each of the four samples there were some districts that had large enrollments in grades K-8 but had very few schools receiving program funds. Even with the increased initial sample size to accommodate discards (explained above), some of these districts had no school drawn into the school

sample. It was determined that these districts should be eliminated from the study on the grounds that they would have been very unlikely to be chosen had the ideal of drawing a simple random sample of schools been implemented.

WEIGHTING

The sampling design described above requires that weights be used in estimating the population values for characteristics of districts and schools. These weights adjust the sampling probabilities so that each district in the sample of districts (or school in the sample of schools) represents its proper share of the population of districts (or schools). An example at the district level will illustrate this concept. Suppose that in a hypothetical sample one district had 100,000 students and was drawn into the sample with probability equal to 1.0 (i.e., it would always be selected into any sample drawn in a like fashion). Suppose that ten other districts in the population each have 10,000 students and one of them is drawn into the sample (its selection probability is 0.1). If the average hours of parent coordination are averaged for these two districts in the sample, the resulting value represents what happens to the typical student (because each of the two sample values represents 100,000 students). Now, if one wishes to know what the typical district is like, then the two values should be multiplied by weights equal to the reciprocal of their sampling probabilities before the values are averaged. The weight for the larger district is 1.0/1.0 = 1.0, because it represents only one district; while the weight for the smaller districts is 1.0/0.1 = 10, because it represents ten districts. The weights cause the smaller district to be treated as if there were nine more just like it in the data base.

REPRESENTATIVENESS AND PRECISION

Great pains were taken to assure that features of importance were accounted for in drawing the sample. These are described in the separate program sections.

Many such samples could have been drawn and each would have produced estimates that deviated from the average value of all such samples. One way of assessing the precision of a sample is to describe the sampling error. Analyses of the data indicate that for data involving proportions or percentages, the standard or sampling error is about .05 or 5 percent at the maximum. Thus, if 50 percent respond that a given activity exists, then the standard error is about 5 percent and an interval of $\pm$1.6 standard errors, called a 90 percent confidence interval, would run from 42 to 58 percent (Gonzalez, Ogue, Shapiro & Tepping, 1975).

NON-SAMPLING ERRORS

The confidence intervals described above presume that the sampling design is valid and that there are no flaws in the data collection. However, even in complete censuses, where the population mean could be calculated directly, there are other sources of error that may invalidate the results. Examples include: inability to obtain information about all cases in the sample, definitional difficulties, differences in the interpretation of questions, inability or unwillingness to provide correct information on the part of respondents, and mistakes in recording or coding the data obtained.

The questionnaires used in the survey were field-tried on a limited number of cases (per federal restraints on burden to pilot-test respondents) to assure that they were not ambiguous. Data were rigorously screened during data collection and call-backs were made to correct inconsistencies and omissions that were noted by this process. In order to encourage frank reporting, provisions for maintaining confidentiality of the data were designed into the study and were explained to the respondents. These efforts must be balanced against the fact that the survey results are self-reported data in an area that does not have a well established framework for inquiry. Thus, there is still the possibility that some of the data are the result of misunderstanding the intent of the questions or trying to report what it was thought the Department of Education would like to hear.

Part of the initial screening process involved a review of each of the codings of responses given to open-ended questions. Once the data were keypunched into machine-readable format, checks for consistency and for outlying values were also performed. Raw data forms were consulted to correct keypunch errors and call-backs were made to rectify inconsistencies. The data that are recorded in the FPS data bases represent the responses provided to the questions with great fidelity.

No attempt has been made to impute data to the districts and schools that were sampled but refused to cooperate. There is no way to estimate what the fact of refusal implies for the missing data values. This was a very small fraction of the data and would not, in our judgment, contribute materially to changing the estimates reported here or to improving the precision of estimation.

INSTRUMENTATION FOR THE FEDERAL PROGRAMS SURVEY

Instruments for the Federal Programs Survey were developed to reflect three facets of the study: 1) the conceptual framework outlined in the previous chapter; 2) the hierarchical organization of school systems; and 3) the differences among and similarities across the four federal programs under study. For each of the four federal programs, a district-level and a school-level questionnaire were created. Each questionnaire addresses the parental involvement activities that are either mandated by the federal program at that level or that may occur because the district or school chooses to implement that form of parental involvement. Table 1 shows the correspondence between the areas of study in the conceptual framework and the content of the questionnaires Questionnaires for all four programs addressed the same broad content areas. Differences among the programs were reflected in differences in the specific questions within these content areas. For example, the ESAA program was interested in more detailed information about the racial and ethnic composition of the advisory committees than were the other programs. ESAA also requested information about Nonprofit Organizations, which are a unique part of that program. The ESEA Title VII Bilingual program was

Table 1. Correspondence Between the Conceptual Framework and the Content of Questionnaires Used in the Federal Programs Survey

Conceptual Framework for the Study	Content Areas in the Federal Programs Survey	
	District-Level Questionnaire	School-Level Questionnaire
Context of Implementation	*District Descriptive/ Demographic Info. District-Level Sources of Funding	*School Descriptive/ Demographic Info. School-Level Sources of Funding
Governance Function	District Advisory Committee Composition/Operation	School Advisory Committee Composition/Operation
Education Function	Not Addressed at the District-Level	School Use of Paid Paraprofessionals School Use of Volunteers Parents as Teachers of Their Own Children
School-Community Relations	Supervision and Coordination of Parental Involvement	Coordination and Promotion of Parental Involvement
School Support Function	Represented in certain response categories in other sections	Represented in certain response categories in other sections
Parent Education Function	Represented in certain response categories in other sections	Represented in certain response categories in other sections

*A substantial part of the district and school demographic information was to be obtained from data bases compiled by the Office of Civil Rights and the National Center for Educational Statistics. Such information was not available at the time this report was written.

interested in the language(s) spoken at advisory committee meetings. The ESEA Title I program is the only one to mandate school-level advisory committees; consequently the section of the Title I school-level questionnaire concerning advisory committees is longer than the corresponding sections of the other school-level questionnaires. The district-level questionnaire was adapted to become a project-level questionnaire for the Follow Through program. Furthermore, response categories were added or modified in several items of both the project-level and school-level Follow Through questionnaires to reflect the broad scope of the program goals, notably the parent education component.

The questionnaires used in the Federal Programs Survey were intended to obtain information about the more formal aspects of the content areas listed in Table 1 such as counts of participants and broad characterizations of activities engaged in by participants. They were designed to be completed by district-level personnel, with some assistance from local schools. Consequently, there are few questions asking for details of the processes engaged in under any of the functions. Much of the interest in the school support, school-community relations, and parent education functions, for example, would be centered on the processes and the content (rather than simply the counts of participants), so these functions are less fully represented in the FPS questionnaires than the other functions. It was felt that the processes and content associated with these functions would not be easily determined by someone at the district level responding to the questionnaires.

Copies of the questionnaires used in the study are contained in Appendix A of this volume.

In order to reduce respondent burden, SDC agreed to use data on demographic characteristics that had been collected by federal agencies. The Common Core of Data (collected by the National Center for Educational Statistics in the fall of 1978) was to provide information on the grade-by-grade enrollment at the district level as well as information about which grades each district considered to be "elementary." The Office of Civil Rights survey of fall, 1978 was to supply racial and ethnic data for approximately 75 percent of the

districts and schools in the FPS samples (the others were not in the OCR survey). Only the OCR data base had arrived by the time this volume was prepared, and it was too late to be included in the presentation.

METHODOLOGY FOR THE FEDERAL PROGRAMS SURVEY

The Federal Programs Survey (FPS) was conducted in three phases: permission and enumeration, data collection, and follow-up. During the permission and enumeration phase, SDC obtained permission from the Chief State School Officers to contact the districts in the study in order to obtain lists of schools served by the programs under study. Lists were obtained of those schools in each district that were participating in the program(s) for which that district had been chosen. These lists were used to select schools for study in the FPS. These contacts with each district (usually by phone) also established the name of a liaison person for SDC to deal with during the remainder of the survey data collection. Typically, this person was the local coordinator or director of the federal program(s) under study.

After FEDAC clearance was obtained for the forms of the FPS questionnaires, copies of the appropriate district-level and school-level forms were sent to the liaison person in each district. This person was to fill out the district-level questionnaire and assign the school-level questionnaires to the member(s) of his (her) staff who is best acquainted with program operations at the schools. District personnel were allowed two weeks to review the questionnaire materials and begin filling them out. Two weeks after the questionnaires were mailed, a trained SDC representative called to establish a firm date for a second call to record the responses to the questionnaire. This form of data collection was used to reduce the time needed for follow-up of incomplete, incorrect, and missing data that occurs in mailout surveys.

Training for the SDC staff who made these calls covered the protocol of dealing with the district liaison person and a thorough review of the questions

asked emphasizing the internal checks that needed to be performed to assure that the data were valid.

The survey was carried out in April and May of 1979.

SOME REPORTING CONVENTIONS

Throughout this report the averages and percentages represent the estimated national values for all districts and schools participating in a particular program. That is, they are obtained by weighted analyses as described above.

In many cases, a percentage of districts or schools having a particular activity is given first, followed by an average value for a measure of the extent of the activity within the districts or schools. These averages are almost always computed using only those districts or schools that had the particular activity. Thus, a statement that, "Thirty-three percent of the schools employed part-time coordinators who devoted a total of five hours per week, on average, to the coordination of parental involvement," would mean that the average of five hours of coordination per week applied only to those schools that employed part-time coordinators (estimated to be 33 percent of all served schools). The other 67 percent of the schools had zero hours of coordination provided by part-time coordinators.

CHAPTER IV. PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN PROGRAMS FUNDED BY TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

THE BACKGROUND OF ESEA TITLE I

In terms of both children served and funds allocated, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is the largest of the four programs under study. At present, 93.7 percent of local educational agencies (LEAs) receive Title I funds (Wang et al., 1978) and a recent study (Hoepfner, Zagorski, & Wellisch, 1977) found that 67 percent of elementary schools receive Title I funds. This program is truly national in scope, affecting every state, almost every LEA, and the majority of schools.

Title I is a categorical entitlement program, meaning that certain students are entitled to receive its service. Its target population is composed of students who are educationally deprived and who reside in areas with high concentrations of low-income families. Its goal is to meet students' needs and to raise student achievement, especially in the areas of reading, language arts, and mathematics. Projects are carried out at either the school level or the LEA level. Title I has an extensive legislative history vis-a-vis parental involvement.

The original legislation (1965) required that parents be involved in developing local project applications. Subsequently, regulations and guidelines were issued to clarify this criterion. In July 1968, advisory committees were suggested; in November 1968, "maximum practical involvement" of parents in all phases of Title I was required. In 1971 local educational agencies were required to provide parents with documents on planning, operating, and evaluating projects. In 1970 a Parent Advisory Council was required at the district level; in 1974 the law was changed to include councils at both the district and school levels, with members selected by parents. The most recent legislation, in 1978, describes in detail the composition and training of Parent Advisory Councils at both levels.

PAST RESEARCH ON PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN TITLE I PROJECTS

Given that Title I is the largest federal education program, it is not surprising that more studies that touch on parental involvement have been done with this program. This is not to imply that a great deal is known about parental involvement in Title I, for research to date would not support such a conclusion. Instead, the scattered findings are more provocative than definitive. In interpreting these findings, it is important to note that all of the studies to be reported predate the implementation of the 1978 amendments to the Title I legislation. Some of the findings may no longer be valid.

As part of the ongoing Sustaining Effects Study being carried out by System Development Corporation, 15,000 parents were interviewed in their homes (in 1977). Certain questions dealt with parental involvement. It was found that few parents of Title I children were aware of a school's Parent Advisory Council; few reported voting in PAC elections, and few said that they were or had been PAC members. Even fewer parents were employed as paraprofessionals.

In a recent report to Congress, the National Institute of Education (1978) summarized findings from four NIE-sponsored studies that addressed, in part, district- and school-level Title I advisory groups. Highlights of the findings were that: principals often dominate school PACs; most PAC members are appointed rather than elected; few districts offer training to PAC members; PACs are seldom involved in planning or evaluating projects, and there is great variability in PAC operations and roles. Perhaps the most important conclusions drawn by NIE are that there is considerable confusion about PAC roles, and that there exists no clear federal policy about parental involvement.

Recently, a fifth study was completed for NIE that specifically addressed one aspect of parental involvement in Title I, the Parent Advisory Council (CPI Associates, 1979). Conceived as an exploratory effort, the study was carried out in three states chosen to reflect variations in state support for PACs. In each state LEAs were chosen to provide a spectrum of demonstrated LEA

support for PACs. In all, eight LEA Parent Advisory Councils and 34 school PACs were included. Data were collected through interviews with LEA and school respondents. Four results were reported, bearing on PAC impact on Title I projects (defined as ideas expressed and taken into account). First, district PACs had moderate impact. Second, school PACs had little impact. Third, the greatest PAC impact was found when the LEA staff sought change and obtained PAC support. Fourth, there was little impact when the PAC desired and attempted to obtain change on its own.

The five NIE-sponsored studies reviewed above provide some leads regarding parental involvement through advisory groups (considered to be a part of the governance function in the Study of Parental Involvement). An important difficulty with each study is that the methodologies employed do not allow for projections of findings to describe Title I PACs nationally.

THE DESIGN OF THE FEDERAL PROGRAMS SURVEY FOR TITLE I

The sample for the Title I Program was drawn from a population of districts having any grades in the range K-8 and more than five pupils per grade. The Title I Program Office in Washington, D.C. does not maintain a data base of participating districts, so our sample was selected from a population of all the districts meeting the requirements stated above.* There were 14,068 districts in this population.

The sampling was conducted by choosing a sampling interval based on the total enrollment in grades K-8 of all districts and by selecting districts systematically using a random start. In order to guarantee representation from all the geographic regions of the country, the population of districts was sorted into the ten Department of Education regions.

---

*A data base provided by Market Data Retrieval was used to establish this sampling frame.

An oversample of 10 percent was selected to allow for refusals and for districts that were not funded by Title I or were no longer funded in grades K-8. Table 2 presents the progress of the sample from the initial draw of 142 districts to the final sample of 129 that responded to the survey.

Table 2. Progress of the Title I Sample

	Number of Districts
Districts Selected Initially	142
Refused to Participate	1
Not Funded by Title I	2
No Schools Selected	6
Refused to Fill Out Forms	4
Final Sample of Districts	129

After districts were selected, they were contacted for lists of served schools (public and private). At this point some of the initial oversample was used up: one refusal and two districts that were not funded by Title I. In the 139 districts that remained, there were 3,321 served schools of which 2,903 were public and 418 were private.

The next step was to sample schools from within these districts. Six districts had no schools selected (as explained in Chapter III) and were dropped from the study. This resulted in 133 districts and 327 schools being selected for participation. Four more districts (with 12 schools) refused to provide the information requested. The final sample was 129 districts with 277 public and 38 private schools.

SURVEY FINDINGS

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

District-level FPS data (Section A of the District Questionnaire, and data obtained in making up the school selection lists) indicate that in 1979 the average district that participated in the Title I program spent $1,349 per pupil in the elementary grades. In the sample, the reported values ranged from $291 per pupil to $3,500 per pupil.* The survey indicates that Title I grants to districts averaged $175,000 nationwide. In the sample the grants ranged from $4,700 to $56,000,000.

The average Title I project served 3.4 public schools and .3 private schools. Thirty-six percent of the districts receiving Title I funds served non-public school students. In the sample, the number of public schools served by Title I in a district ranged from 1 to 195 while the number of private schools served by Title I in a district ranged from 0 to 58.

School-level FPS data (Sections A and G of the Title I school-level questionnaire) indicate that in 1979 the average public school offering Title I services in any of the grades K-8 had a total enrollment of 386 pupils and provided Title I services to 96 of them (24 percent). In these schools, 34 percent of the pupils were considered to be low-income students while 6 percent lived with parents or guardians whose home language is not English.

---

*These figures should be interpreted with caution as districts do not use uniform accounting procedures to arrive at the estimated per-pupil expenditure.

Table 3 shows the estimated percentages of Title I public schools in various categories of classification with respect to urban or rural location.

On the average, Title I public schools had participated in the program for a total of 10.3 years and indicated that they expected to spend $39,953 of Title I funds during the 1978-1979 year. The average expenditure of Title I funds per served pupil was $499.

Table 4 shows the percentages of Title I public schools that were participating in the three other programs that are part of this study and also participated in the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L.94-142). In addition, 51 percent of the schools received other federal funds and 59 percent received state categorical funds.

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN THE GOVERNANCE OF TITLE I PROJECTS

Parents may participate in the governance of Title I projects at both the school and district levels by becoming members of the federally mandated advisory councils at either level. This section of the Title I chapter deals with these councils.

District-Level Title I Parent Advisory Councils (District-Level Questionnaire, Section C)

The survey data concentrate on the characteristics of the voting members of the District-Level Parent Advisory Councils (PACs). Information about the total size of the district-level PAC was not collected.

In the sample, two of the districts indicated that they did not have a district-level PAC. It is estimated that less than 0.5 percent of Title I-served districts did not have a district-level PAC at the time of the survey.

The average district-level PAC, nationwide, is estimated to have had 10.7 voting members of whom 10.0 were parents and 9.0 were parents of children

Table 3. Title I-Served Schools Classified as to Urban or Rural Location (Entries are estimated percentages of the total population of Title I schools.)

Location	Percentage of Schools
Large city, over 200,000 population	11
Suburb of a large city	6
Middle-size city, 50,000 to 200,000 population	9
Suburb of a middle-size city	4
Small city or town, less than 50,000 population	31
Rural area near a large or middle-size city	7
Rural area, not near a large or middle-size city	32

Table 4. Estimated Percentages of Schools Served by Title I and by Other Specific Federal Programs

Served by Title I and by:	Percentage of Schools
The Emergency School Aid Act	15
Follow Through	1
ESEA Title VII Bilingual	9
PL 94-142 (Education for All Handicapped)	64
None of the above in addition to Title I	29

Note: The percentages add to more than 100 because of the overlap in the categories, especially involving PL 94-142. No school in the sample was funded by all programs, however.

served by Title I. Another perspective on these findings shows that in 83 percent of the Title I district-level PACs the voting members were exclusively parents, and in 45 percent the voting members were exclusively parents of children served by Title I. Fewer than 5 percent of the districts have PACs in which parents of served children constituted less than 51 percent of the voting membership. Sixteen percent of the districts allowed school professional personnel to hold voting memberships on the PAC and 11 percent allowed paid aides this privilege. Fourteen percent of the district PACs allowed representatives of non-public schools to hold voting memberships.*

In 99.8 percent of all district-level Title I PACs, parents of Title I-served children had voting memberships. In about 30 percent of these PACs, all parents of served children were elected, in 41 percent they were all appointed, and in 26 percent they all volunteered to serve. The remainder selected parents of served children by more than one of the means listed above. Parents of non-Title I students attending schools in the district held voting memberships in 90 percent of the district-level PACs in which they participated (about 36 percent of district-level PACs). In 37 percent of these PACs they all volunteered to serve, in 30 percent they were all appointed, and in 27 percent they were all elected.

The 1978 amendments to the Title I statute specify that PAC members are to be elected to office, while the previous legislation did not. Many PACs were probably already in existence when the amendments were signed into law. Presumably, districts have come into compliance with the new legislative mandate since the survey was performed.

The Title I statute and regulations (existing and proposed as of June 1980) do not address the issue of the length of term of office for the district-level

*Some of these percentages represent double counts, e.g., a parent paid aide would be counted as a voting parent and as a voting paid aide. The districts consider these people to represent both categories and would not assign them exclusively to one or the other.

advisory committee members. However, the statute and proposed regulations do indicate a sense that continuing service is valued by mandating that members of school-level PACs be elected to two-year terms of office. The FPS data do not address this question directly, however, they do indicate that in 84 percent of the districts, a member may serve on the district-level PAC for an unrestricted number of consecutive terms of office. In an additional 13 percent of the districts, a member may serve for at least two consecutive terms of office. This indicates that most districts have allowed for continuing participation of PAC members, provided that they are reelected, reappointed or volunteer to serve again.

The average Title I district-level PAC is estimated to have held four formal business meetings during the 1978-1979 school year. Two of the critical activities associated with conducting formal meetings of the district-level PAC that were examined are: presiding at the PAC meeting and setting the PAC meeting agenda.

In 57 percent of the districts, the PAC chairperson and/or another PAC member chaired the formal meetings of the district-level PAC, while in 23 percent, the Project Director and/or the Parent Coordinator chaired these meetings. In 19 percent of the districts, the Project Director and PAC chairperson shared this role.

Setting the agenda for formal PAC meetings involves more people, in a greater variety of combinations, than does presiding at the meetings. It was estimated that: in 34 percent of the districts the Project Director and/or Parent Coordinator set the agenda without the assistance of a PAC member; in 17 percent of the districts, the PAC chairperson or other PAC member set the agenda without the assistance of either the Project Director or the Parent Coordinator; in 49 percent of the districts, the Project Director and/or Parent Coordinator shared the agenda setting with the PAC chairperson or other PAC members.

Project personnel (either the Project Director or the Parent Coordinator) seem to control these two functions in a sizable fraction of the districts. This does not mean that parental input is ignored or rejected in these districts, but it does mean that parents have not achieved a working parity with project personnel in the running of Parent Advisory Committees in these districts.

Another important aspect of the governance of Title I projects at the district-level has to do with the level of authority the district PAC has with respect to various management activities. The Title I statute indicates that districts are to give to "each advisory council that it establishes... responsibility for advising it in planning for, and implementation and evaluation of, its programs and projects assisted under (Title I)."* Table 5 presents a tabulation of the percentages of Title I district-level PACs that were estimated to have each of the four levels of authority listed (column headings) with respect to a wide variety of management activities. Some of these are not specifically mentioned in the legislation (e.g. personnel), but are of interest in this study as indicators of the extent to which districts may expand the responsibilities of PACs.

Developing the project application is the activity in which Title I district-level PACs had the greatest authority. Their level of authority was less with respect to management operations such as needs assessments and evaluations and even less still in areas having to do with budget. Activities having to do with personnel seem to have been outside the authority of the Title I PACs altogether at the time of the survey.

Only 12 percent of the district-level PACs had subcommittees that met regularly for the purpose of handling PAC business. The most frequently occurring subcommittee (6 percent of all districts) dealt with management functions such as budget, personnel or evaluation. These relatively small percentages suggest that regular subcommittees do not account for very much

*Amendment to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Section 125(b), Congressional Record, October 10, 1978, H12143.

Table 5. Level of Authority of Title I District-Level PACs in Various Management Activities
(Entries are estimated percentages of all Title I district-level PACs.)

	PAC has no advisory or decision-making role and no responsibility or no opportunity for involvement.	PAC advises the LEA in making decisions; LEA has sole decision-making responsibility.	Decision-making responsibility is jointly shared by PAC and LEA.	PAC has exclusive or principal decision-making authority.
Develop Project Application	3	63	34	0
Conduct Needs Assessment	31	39	27	3
Plan Project Components	32	41	26	1
Establish Project Objectives	22	53	24	1
Monitor Implementation	23	47	29	1
Evaluate Meeting of Goals	21	44	33	3
Review PI Budget	38	26	32	4
Review Project Budget	33	37	27	3
Sign Off PI Budget	45	29	18	8
Sign Off Project Budget	45	34	16	4
Establish Requirements for Hiring Parents	68	24	9	0
Select Project Professionals	72	26	1	1
Select Project Paraprofessionals	79	21	0	0
Evaluate Project Professionals	74	26	0	1
Evaluate Project Paraprofessionals	79	21	0	0
Handle Complaints	53	33	13	1

Note: The row labels in this table are shortened versions of the row labels used in the Title I district-level questionnaire, question C-11.

parental involvement in governance that is not represented in the findings presented for the entire PACs. Had subcommittees occurred with greater frequency, it would have been necessary to account for their activity more fully in assessing the overall level of parental involvement in governance at the district level.

One measure of the support for PAC is the budget that is allowed for its operating expenses and activities, and the proportion of that budget that it controls. Forty-two percent of the district PACs had a budget. The average budget was $1,250 per year. Only 47 percent of these district-level PACs were able to use this money at their own discretion. However, in these districts (about 20 percent of all Title I districts) the entire budget was for use at the PAC's discretion in almost all cases.

School-Level Title I Parent Advisory Councils (School-Level Questionnaire, Section B)

The 1978 amendments to the Title I legislation state that "any project school in which not more than one full-time equivalent staff member is paid with funds provided under this title, and in which not more than forty students participate in such programs" need not have a school-level PAC. The present survey did not obtain a count of the number of full-time equivalent staff members paid by Title I. However, it was possible to look at the schools in which more than 40 pupils are served by Title I programs. It was found that 12 percent of such schools do not have school-level PACs. The legislation also states that "any project school in which seventy-five or more students are served by programs assisted by (Title I) funds... (the school-level PAC) shall be composed of not less than eight members."* The data from the FPS indicate that 57 percent of schools that reported serving 75 or more students had PACs composed of seven or fewer members. About 22 percent had PACs composed of four or fewer members. Only 3 percent had no PAC at all.

*Amendment to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Section 125(a), Congressional Record, October 10, 1978, H12143.

Many committees may have been established for the 1978-1979 school year before the 1978 amendments were signed into law. Presumably, schools have been moving into compliance with this mandate since the survey was performed.

The average school-level PAC is estimated to have had 9.4 voting members of whom 8.8 were parents and 7.3 were parents of Title I-served students. In parallel with the district level data, it was found that in 85 percent of the Title I school-level PACs, the voting members were exclusively parents, and in 48 percent of them, the voting members were exclusively parents of served children. Just under 10 percent of the schools had PACs in which parents of served children constitute less than 51 percent of the voting membership. Twelve percent of the schools permitted school professional personnel to hold voting memberships and 9 percent gave that privilege to aides. Only three percent of Title I school PACs had voting members from non-public schools.

Parents of served children held voting memberships in 100 percent of the school PACs. In 35 percent of the schools, these parents all volunteered to serve on the PAC; in 15 percent they were all appointed, and in 49 percent they were all elected. Parents of children not served by Title I were given voting memberships in 44 percent of the school PACs. In 43 percent of these schools, such parents all volunteered to serve and in another 43 percent, they were all elected. In the remaining 14 percent they were all appointed.

Title I legislation, as amended in 1978, requires that school-level PACs be formed by election. Presumably, the survey occurred as schools were beginning to come into compliance with the legislation.

The Title I statute specifies that members of school-level PACs are to be elected for two-year terms. Responses to the school-level FPS questionnaire indicate that 80 percent of the school-level Title I PACs permitted members to serve an unlimited number of consecutive terms while an additional 14 percent permitted at least two consecutive terms. As with the district-level PACs, most schools seemed to provide for continuing service on PACs, if the members are reelected, reappointed, or continue to volunteer.

The average number of formal, school-level PAC meetings is estimated to have been 4.5 per year. Conducting meetings and setting agendas are important activities connected with these formal meetings and are discussed below.

In 56 percent of the school-level PACs, the meetings were conducted by the PAC chairperson and/or another officer of the PAC. In 25 percent of the PACs, the Project Director and/or the Parent Coordinator and/or the school principal conducted the meetings. In 15 percent the meetings were conducted by combinations of PAC members and officers with the professional program staff or the principal, and in 4 percent they were conducted by another individual entirely.

In 24 percent of the school-level PACs, the agenda was set by the PAC chairperson and/or other PAC member. In another 24 percent, the Project Director and/or the Parent Coordinator and/or the building principal set the agenda. In 48 percent of the school-level PACs, the agenda setting was shared among PAC members, program professional staff, and the building principal. In 4 percent, some other person set the agendas.

As with the district-level PACs, the school PAC members have not achieved a working parity with the professional staff of the project in a sizable fraction of the schools.

Table 6 presents a tabulation of the percentages of Title I school-level PACs that were estimated to have each of four levels of authority (listed as column headings) with respect to 16 different areas of management (row headings). This table parallels Table 5 which presents district-level information. Indeed, the findings from the two tables are very similar. The pattern of authority for school-level PACs closely resembles that of district-level PACs: their greatest authority was in the area of project application and they had virtually no say in the hiring or evaluation of staff.

It is estimated that 11 percent of the school-level PACs had subcommittees that met regularly for the purpose of handling PAC business. As with the

Table 6. Level of Authority of Title I School-Level PACs in Various Management Activities
(Entries are estimated percentages of all Title I school-level PACs.)

	PAC has no advisory or decision-making role and no responsibility or no opportunity for involvement.	PAC advises the LEA in making decisions; LEA has sole decision-making responsibility.	Decision-making responsibility is jointly shared by PAC and LEA.	PAC has exclusive or principal decision-making authority.
Develop Project Application	9	62	29	0
Conduct Needs Assessment	21	50	25	3
Plan Project Components	20	53	26	1
Establish Project Objectives	20	50	30	0
Monitor Implementation	14	60	24	2
Evaluate Meeting of Goals	14	55	28	3
Review PI Budget	30	38	27	5
Review Project Budget	33	46	18	3
Sign Off PI Budget	44	31	16	9
Sign Off Project Budget	46	36	15	3
Establish Requirements for Hiring Parents	65	26	8	1
Select Project Professionals	76	19	5	0
Select Project Paraprofessionals	78	18	4	0
Evaluate Project Professionals	71	24	4	1
Evaluate Project Paraprofessionals	77	18	4	1
Handle Complaints	39	41	18	2

Note: The row labels in this table are shortened versions of the row labels used in the Title I school-level questionnaire, question B-12.

district-level PACs, the most commonly occurring of these subcommittees (8 percent of school-level PACs) dealt with management functions such as budget, personnel or evaluation.

With respect to budgets for operating expenses and activities, only 22 percent of school-level PACs had such budgets, which averaged $570 per year. Fifty-five percent of these schools (about 12 percent of all Title I schools) had discretion over at least part of this budget, usually all of it.

A part of the FPS investigated the extent to which district-level and school-level PACs overlapped in membership. Forty-four percent of the district-level PACs were exclusively composed of members of school-level PACs. Another 41 percent contained no members of school-level PACs. It is estimated that in 20 percent of the Title I schools, all of the school PAC members were members of the district-level PAC as well.

COORDINATION OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

District-Level Coordination (District-Level Questionnaire, Section B)

Nationwide, it is estimated that 62 percent of Title I districts provided some district-level coordination of parental involvement activities in the Title I program. Among all Title I districts, an average of 5.4 hours per week were spent in coordination of parental involvement activities related to the Title I program.

Eleven percent of the districts participating in the Title I program employed full-time coordinators who devoted some of their time to the coordination of Title I parental involvement activities. (They were not necessarily full-time employees of the Title I project alone.) These districts employed an average of 1.0 such coordinators who devoted an average of 17.0 hours per week to the coordination of Title I parental involvement activities.

Fifty-nine percent of the Title I districts employed part-time coordinators (an average of 1.5) who devoted a total of 6 hours per week, on average, to the coordination of Title I parental involvement activities. (Again, these coordinators may have been paid from other sources in addition to Title I.)

The districts providing Title I parent coordination services were asked to check off the activities engaged in by their coordinators, and to indicate which two were engaged in most frequently. Sixty-four percent of these districts indicated that attending meetings to inform parents about district or school activities or policies was one of the two most frequent activities (all districts having coordinators provided this service). Forty-nine percent of the districts providing coordination indicated that coordinating activities for parents to train them and/or inform them about regulations and guidelines for the Title I program was one of the two most frequent activities (23 percent of the districts with coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not provide this service). Thirty-two percent of the districts providing coordination indicated that recruiting parents for involvement in Title I district or school activities, such as serving on advisory committees or volunteering in the classroom, was one of the two most frequent activities (16 percent of districts with coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not provide this service).

School-Level Coordination (School-Level Questionnaire, Section F)

Nationwide, it is estimated that 35 percent of Title I schools provided some school-level coordination of parental involvement activities. Among all Title I schools, an average of 3.2 hours per week were spent in coordination of Title I-related parental involvement activities.

Four percent of Title I-served schools employed full-time coordinators (an average of 1.5) who contributed a total of 42 hours per week, on average, to the coordination of Title I parental involvement activities. Thirty-three percent of the schools employed part-time coordinators (an average of two) who devoted a total of five hours per week, on average, to the coordination

of Title I parental involvement activities. (As with the district-level coordinators, the full-time or part-time status of these coordinators does not imply that their entire salary is paid by Title I.)

For the schools providing Title I parent coordination services, the respondent was asked to check off the activities engaged in by these coordinators and to indicate which two were engaged in most frequently. In 58 percent of these schools, recruiting parents for involvement in Title I district or school activities (such as serving on a PAC or volunteering in the classroom) was indicated as one of the two most frequent activities of coordinators. Nine percent of the schools having coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not offer this service. In 56 percent, one of the two most frequent activities was participation in meetings to inform parents about district or school activities and policies. Three percent of the schools with coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not offer this service. In 25 percent of the schools, one of the two most frequent activities was to conduct workshops to inform parents about the regulations and guidelines for the Title I program. Thirty-four percent of the schools with coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not offer this service.

Contrasting the school level to the district level, it seems clear that school-level coordinators were more often concerned with recruiting parents to participate in the program and were less often involved in providing information about regulations and guidelines than were district-level coordinators.

PARENT PARTICIPATION IN THE TITLE I EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM (SECTIONS C, D AND E OF SCHOOL-LEVEL FPS SURVEY)

Parents can participate in the educational program in three ways: as paid paraprofessionals, as volunteers, and as instructors of their own children at home.

Based on the survey, 60 percent of schools served by Title I employed an average of 3.4 paid paraprofessionals each. Twenty-two percent of Title I schools employed an average of 2.1 parents of children enrolled at the school in some of these positions, while 9 percent employed parents of Title I-served children (an average of 1.6 per school). Ninety-eight percent of the schools employing parents provided an average of 28 hours per year of formal training for the paid parent paraprofessionals who work directly with children in the instructional process.

For each school in the survey, the respondent was requested to check off activities of paid parent paraprofessionals and mark the two engaged in most frequently. Two activities clearly stood out: 79 percent of schools with Title I-paid parent paraprofessionals reported that one of the two most frequently engaged in activities was working with individuals or small groups, reviewing or reteaching skills and concepts they have already learned. Seventy-one percent reported that giving special assistance to children with particular academic difficulties or weaknesses was one of the two activities engaged in most frequently. They also assist with non-instructional tasks (e.g., roll-taking, correcting papers, playground, field trips), and in acquisition, preparation or retrieval of instructional materials. (Together these were indicated as among the two most frequent activities by 31 percent of the schools with Title I paid parent paraprofessionals.)

The opportunity to nominate candidates for paid parent paraprofessional positions or to make the final selection could represent areas of strong parental influence on the educational process. The management activities of PACs (Tables 5 and 6) suggest that little parental involvement of this type would be found, and this is, indeed, the case. A series of questions about the individuals or groups with greatest responsibility in these two areas revealed that PAC or a special hiring committee with parent members contributed to making nominations for these positions in only 12 percent of the schools. In only 4 percent of the schools did these two groups contribute to

the final selection. In all but 1 percent of the schools having paid parent paraprofessionals, the parent groups shared this authority with district or school professional staff.

District personnel officers alone made nominations in 25 percent of the schools and made final selections in 29 percent. Teachers alone made nominations in 15 percent of the schools and made final selections in 2 percent. The building principal alone made nominations in 22 percent of the schools and made the final selection in 39 percent. Parents clearly have little input in this process.

Sixteen percent of Title I schools had a volunteer component in the Title I project. In 14 percent of the schools parents of children currently enrolled at the school served as volunteers (an average of 11.3 per school). In 69 percent of the schools where parents are volunteers formal training was provided to volunteers (an average of 21 hours per year).

Parent volunteers performed the same tasks as paid parent paraprofessionals. Forty-five percent of schools with parent volunteers indicated that working with individual children or small groups, reviewing or reteaching skills and concepts students have already learned was among the two most frequent activities of parent volunteers. Forty percent indicated that giving special assistance to children with particular academic difficulties or weaknesses was one of the two most frequent activities of parent volunteers. Thirty-one percent cited work in acquisition, preparation or retrieval of instructional materials while 25 percent cited relieving teachers of non-instructional tasks as among the two most frequent activities of parent volunteers.

Parent volunteers are less likely to be used in instructional roles than are paid parent paraprofessionals, but substantial numbers of parent volunteers do engage in activities that supplement the instructional program.

The survey indicates that 70 percent of Title I-served schools tried to involve parents in the educational process as teachers for their own children

at home through a diversity of activities or services provided to parents. Of the 70 percent of schools with any of these activities, 38 percent provided group training sessions, 55 percent provided workshops in which parents made educational games and/or other instructional materials, 36 percent provided individual training sessions, 81 percent sent home specially prepared materials for parents to use with their children, and 76 percent sent home written handouts (e.g., pamphlets, handbooks) intended for individual home study. The data collected in this area did not include information about the frequency or intensity of these activities, or about the costs.

FINANCING PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN TITLE I PROJECTS

The expenditures associated with parental involvement activities may be accounted for in a variety of ways. Indeed, what is considered to be a part of parental involvement also varied considerably from place to place. The Federal Programs Survey asked whether or not each district used a "line item" form of accounting for parental involvement. Fifty-five percent of the districts used a line item for parental involvement. Among these districts, however, there was little agreement as to what activities were included in the line item. For example, only 68 percent of the line items included advisory group meeting expenses while virtually all districts have these groups. Only 6 percent of districts included the costs of home-school activities such as using parents as teachers for their own children at home even though 70 percent of schools have these activities.

There is no uniformity in the manner by which LEAs keep track of parental involvement expenses. One district may cost parent paid aides under "parental involvement" while another district will locate these costs under "instruction." Accordingly, we are not able to assign any dollar amounts to the costs of parental involvement activities.

CHAPTER V. PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN PROGRAMS FUNDED BY THE EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID ACT (ESAA)

THE BACKGROUND OF ESAA

The second largest of the programs in the Study of Parental Involvement is the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA). While ESAA projects are found throughout the United States, less than 5 percent of the LEAs currently receive ESAA funds.

ESAA is a non-categorical education program. Its target population is composed of students in districts that are implementing or are planning to implement a desegregation plan. Its goals are to reduce racial group isolation, to treat problems arising from desegregation, and to overcome the educational disadvantagement of racial isolation. Projects are carried out at the district level, at the school level, or through non-profit organizations

PAST RESEARCH ON PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN ESAA PROJECTS

The longitudinal impact studies (Coulson et al., 1976) showed that the degree of parental involvement was not influenced by various activities used to promote parental participation; however, more parents participated in schools where the principal assumed greater responsibility for school-community relations. In turn, degree of parental involvement was not found to be related to outcome measures. On the other hand, an in-depth study of a subset of ESAA schools (Wellisch et al., 1976) revealed that student achievement showed greater gains when parents were present in the classroom as instructional aides, volunteers, or visitors--but parental participation outside the classroom, such as through membership in advisory committees or as non-instructional aides, had no impact. Further, the use of parent aides in the classroom was found to influence student performance, but not so when the aides were outsiders.

THE DESIGN OF THE FEDERAL PROGRAMS SURVEY FOR ESAA

The sample for the ESAA Program was drawn from a population of served districts having any grades in the range K-8 and more than five pupils per grade. The ESAA Program Office in Washington, D.C. provided a list of all participating districts. There were 560 districts in this population.

The sampling was conducted by choosing a sampling interval based on the total enrollment in grades K-8 of all served districts and selecting districts systematically using a random start. In order to guarantee representation from all the geographic regions of the country, the population of districts was sorted into the ten Department of Education regions.

Several other program features required explicit representation in the sample. The most important of these was the distinction between "state apportionment" and "special projects" as the basis for funding. The special projects were further divided into so-called "pilot" projects and "magnet school" projects. Districts were first grouped, within regions, into three categories: "basic" grantees (those districts funded out of state apportionment), "magnet" grantees (those districts not funded with a "basic" grant which were operating only a "magnet school" program), and "pilot" grantees (districts not participating in "basic" or "magnet" programs but which were running a "pilot" program). If a district was running a "basic" program it was only included in the "basic" grouping even if it had "pilot" or "magnet" programs also. The lists of schools obtained from each district included all ESAA-funded schools, thus all schools had an opportunity to be sampled.

A second feature of these programs, which the program office wished to have represented, was the presence of activities carried out by ESAA-funded Non-Profit Organizations (NPOs). The ESAA program office provided a list of districts in which ESAA-funded NPOs were conducting programs. Within each of the groups formed (by program type as indicated above) two further groupings were formed: districts with NPO activities and districts without NPO activities. After the list was organized in this fashion, the sample was selected

with an oversample of 5 percent to allow for refusals and for districts that were not funded in grades K-8. Table 7 presents the progress of the sample from the initial draw of 109 districts to the final sample of 87 that responded to the survey.

After the initial sample of 109 districts was selected, district representatives were contacted for lists of served schools (public and private). At this point some of the initial oversample was used up: three refusals and four districts that were not funded by ESAA in grades K-8. In the 102 districts that remained, there were 2,693 served schools of which 2,567 were public and 126 were private.

The next step was to sample schools from within these districts. Ten districts had no schools selected (as explained in Chapter III) and were dropped from the study. This resulted in 92 districts and 252 schools being selected for participation. Five more districts (with 15 schools) refused to provide the information requested. Three public schools and one private school had no student services and were dropped. Two private schools refused to participate. The final sample was 87 districts with 219 public and 12 private schools.

Table 7. Progress of the ESAA Sample

	Number of Districts
Districts Selected Initially	109
Refused to Participate	3
Not Funded by ESAA in K-8*	4
No Schools Selected	10
Refused to Fill Out Forms	5
Final Sample of Districts	87

*These appeared to be discrepancies from the information received from the ESAA Program Office. They may have arisen because of changes in the projects after the list was sent to SDC.

SURVEY FINDINGS

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

District-level FPS data (Section A of the District Questionnaire, and data obtained in making up the school selection lists) indicate that in 1979 the average district that participated in the ESAA program spent $1,533 per pupil in the elementary grades. In the sample, the reported values ranged from $275 per pupil to $2,430 per pupil.* The survey indicates that ESAA grants to districts averaged $460,800 nationwide. In the sample the grants ranged from $23,900 to $9,426,000.

The average ESAA project served 7.5 public schools and .3 private schools. Thirty-eight percent of the districts receiving ESAA funds served non-public school students. In the sample, the number of public schools served by ESAA in a district ranged from 1 to 247 while the number of private schools served by ESAA in a district ranged from 0 to 14.

School-level FPS data (Sections A and G of the school-level questionnaire) indicate that in 1979 the average public school offering ESAA services in any of the grades K-8 had a total enrollment of 332 pupils and provided ESAA services to 246 of them (49 percent). In these schools, 49 percent of the pupils were considered to be low-income students while 10 percent lived with parents or guardians whose home language is not English.

Table 8 shows the estimated percentages of ESAA public schools in various categories of classification with respect to urban or rural location.

---

*These figures should be interpreted with caution as districts do not use uniform accounting procedures to arrive at the estimated per-pupil expenditure.

Table 8. ESAA-Served Schools Classified as to Urban or Rural Location (Entries are estimated percentages of the total population of ESAA schools.)

Location	Percentage of Schools
Large city, over 200,000 population	38
Suburb of a large city	9
Middle-size city, 50,000 to 200,000 population	15
Suburb of a middle-size city	2
Small city or town, less than 50,000 population	20
Rural area near a large or middle-size city	6
Rural area, not near a large or middle-size city	10

On the average, ESAA public schools have participated in the program for a total of 4.0 years and indicated that they expected to spend $37,300 of ESAA funds during the 1978-1979 year. The average expenditure of ESAA funds per served pupil is $246.

Table 9 shows the percentages of ESAA public schools that are participating in the three other programs that are part of this study and also participate in the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142). In addition, 50 percent of the schools receive other federal funds and 69 percent receive state categorical funds.

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN THE GOVERNANCE OF ESAA PROJECTS

Parents may participate in the governance of ESAA projects by becoming members of the federally mandated advisory committees at the district level. This section of the ESAA chapter deals with these district-wide advisory committees (DACs).

Table 9. Estimated Percentages of Schools Served by ESAA and by Other Specific Federal Programs

Served by ESAA and by:	Percentage of Schools
ESEA Title I	68
Follow Through	2
ESEA Title VII Bilingual	14
PL 94-142 (Education for All Handicapped)	59
None of the above in addition to ESAA	14

Note: The percentages add to more than 100 because of the overlap in the categories, especially involving Title I and PL 94-142. No school in the sample was funded by all programs, however.

The legislation for the ESAA program states that the application for funding must be:

> "developed with the participation of a committee of parents of children enrolled in the applicant's schools, teachers, and, when applicable, secondary school students ...," and
>
> "that the program will be operated in consultation with, and with the involvement of, parents of the children and representatives of the area to be served, including (the committee mentioned above)."*

*From the Emergency School Aid Act, Section 610(a), Congressional Record, October 10, 1978, H12170.

District-Level Advisory Committees (District-Level Questionnaire, Section C)

The survey data concentrate on the characteristics of the voting members of the DACs. Information about the total size of DACs was not collected. It is estimated that less than 1.5 percent of ESAA-served districts did not have a DAC at the time of the survey.

The average DAC, nationwide, is estimated to have had 19.8 voting members of whom 11.5 were parents and 8.7 were parents of children served by ESAA. Another perspective on these findings shows that in 18 percent of the DACs the voting members were exclusively parents, and in none of them were the voting members exclusively parents of children served by ESAA. In 79 percent of the DACs, parents of served children constituted less than 51 percent of the voting membership. Eighty percent of the districts allowed school professional personnel to hold voting memberships on the DAC and 41 percent allowed paid aides this privilege. Thirty-seven percent of the DACs allowed representatives of non-public schools to hold voting memberships. Eighty-eight percent had voting members who were community representatives.* Seventy-six percent allowed students to hold voting memberships.

Parents of ESAA-served children had voting memberships on all DACs. In 20 percent of DACs, all parents of served children were elected, in 37 percent they were all appointed, and in 43 percent they all volunteered to serve. Parents of non-ESAA students attending schools in the district held voting memberships in all of the DACs in which they participated (about 52 percent of DACs). In 25 percent of these DACs they all volunteered to serve, in 56 percent they were all appointed, and in 18 percent they were all elected.

---

*Some of these percentages represent double counts, e.g., a parent paid aide would be counted as a voting parent and as a voting paid aide. The districts consider these people to represent both categories and would not assign them exclusively to one or the other.

FPS data indicate that in 83 percent of the districts, a member may serve on the DAC for an unrestricted number of consecutive terms of office. In an additional 14 percent of the districts, a member may serve for at least two consecutive terms of office. This indicates that most districts have allowed for continuing participation of DAC members, provided that they are reelected, reappointed or volunteer to serve again.

The average ESAA DAC is estimated to have held 10.1 formal business meetings during the 1978-1979 school year. Two of the critical activities associated with conducting formal meetings of the DAC that were examined are: presiding at the DAC meeting and setting the DAC meeting agenda.

In 79 percent of the districts, the DAC chairperson and/or another DAC member chaired the formal meetings of the DAC, while in 10 percent, the Project Director and/or the Parent Coordinator chaired these meetings. In 9 percent of the districts, the Project Director and/or Parent Coordinator shared this role with the DAC chairperson or other DAC officer. In the remaining 2 percent, some other person (not a DAC member) chaired the meetings.

Setting the agenda for formal DAC meetings involves more people, in a greater variety of combinations, than does presiding at the meetings. It was estimated that: in 27 percent of the districts the Project Director and/or Parent Coordinator set the agenda without the assistance of a DAC member; in five percent of the districts, the DAC chairperson or other DAC member set the agenda without the assistance of either the Project Director or the Parent Coordinator; in 68 percent of the districts, the Project Director and/or Parent Coordinator shared the agenda setting with the DAC chairperson or other DAC members.

Project personnel (either the Project Director or the Parent Coordinator) seem to control the agenda-setting function in a sizable fraction of ESAA districts. This does not mean that parental input is ignored or rejected in these districts, but it does mean that parents have not achieved a working

parity with project personnel in the running of District-wide Advisory Committees in these districts.

Another important aspect of the governance of ESAA projects at the district level has to do with the level of authority the DAC has with respect to various management activities. Table 10 presents a tabulation of the percentages of DACs that were estimated to have each of the four levels of authority listed (column headings).

Developing the project application, conducting needs assessments, determining objectives, and planning components are the activities in which DACs had the greatest authority. Their level of authority was less with respect to management operations such as budget review and sign-off (except that part dealing with parental involvement). Activities having to do with personnel seem to have been outside the authority of the DACs altogether at the time of the survey.

Only 27 percent of the DACs had subcommittees that met regularly for the purpose of handling DAC business. The most frequently occurring subcommittee (27 percent of all districts) dealt with management functions such as budget, personnel or evaluation. The next most frequently occurring subcommittee (20 percent of all districts) dealt with public relations. No other subcommittees occurred in more than 1 percent of all districts. These relatively small percentages suggest that regular subcommittees do not account for very much parental involvement in governance that is not represented in the findings presented for the entire DACs. Had subcommittees occurred with greater frequency, it would have been necessary to account for their activity more fully in assessing the overall level of parental involvement in governance at the district level.

One measure of the support for DAC is the budget that is allowed for its operating expenses and activities, and the proportion of that budget that it controls. Thirty percent of the DACs had a budget. The average budget was

Table 10. Level of Authority of ESAA DACs in Various Management Activities (Entries are estimated percentages of all ESAA DACs.)

	DAC has no advisory or decision-making role and no responsibility or no opportunity for involvement.	DAC advises the LEA in making decisions; LEA has sole decision-making responsibility.	Decision-making responsibility is jointly shared by DAC and LEA.	DAC has exclusive or principal decision-making authority.
Develop Project Application	2	49	49	0
Conduct Needs Assessment	7	48	45	0
Plan Project Components	4	45	51	0
Establish Project Objectives	2	46	52	0
Monitor Implementation	15	37	48	0
Evaluate Meeting of Goals	9	46	45	0
Review PI Budget	20	36	43	0
Review Project Budget	34	45	21	0
Sign Off PI Budget	21	39	40	0
Sign Off Project Budget	35	43	21	0
Establish Requirements for Hiring Parents	35	39	25	0
Select Project Professionals	57	37	6	0
Select Project Paraprofessionals	53	41	6	0
Evaluate Project Professionals	63	32	4	0
Evaluate Project Paraprofessionals	64	31	4	0
Handle Complaints	45	39	16	0

Note: The row labels in this table are shortened versions of the row labels used in the ESAA district-level questionnaire, question C-11.

$880 per year. Only 13 percent of these district-level DACs were able to use any of this money at their own discretion. However, in these districts (about 4 percent of all ESAA districts) the entire budget was for use at the DAC's discretion in almost all cases.

Although school-level advisory committees are not mandated in the ESAA legislation, the districts reported that 33 percent of the participating schools, on average, had such committees. They also reported that in 8 percent of the DACs the voting membership was composed exclusively of voting members of school-level advisory committees, and that in 62 percent of DACs none of the voting members was a voting member of a school-level advisory committee. In the FPS sample of ESAA schools, it was found that 31 percent had school-level advisory committees.

COORDINATION OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

District-Level Coordination (District-Level Questionnaire, Section B)

Nationwide, it is estimated that 78 percent of ESAA districts provided some district-level coordination of parental involvement activities in the ESAA program. Among all ESAA districts, an average of 34.6 hours per week was spent in coordination of parental involvement activities related to the ESAA program.

Forty-six percent of the districts participating in the ESAA program employed full-time coordinators who devoted some of their time to the coordination of ESAA parental involvement activities. (They were not necessarily full-time employees of the ESAA project alone.) These districts employed an average of 2.2 such coordinators who devoted an average of 57.4 hours per week to the coordination of ESAA parental involvement activities.

Sixty-nine percent of the ESAA districts employed part-time coordinators (an average of 2.0) who devoted a total of 12.1 hours per week, on average, to

the coordination of ESAA parental involvement activities. (Again, these coordinators may have been paid by other sources in addition to ESAA.)

The districts providing ESAA parent coordination services were asked to check off the activities engaged in by their coordinators, and to indicate which two were engaged in most frequently. Sixty-two percent of these districts indicated that attending meetings to inform parents about district or school activities or policies was one of the two most frequent activities (only 8 percent of the districts having coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not provide this service). Forty-six percent of the districts providing coordination indicated that recruiting parents for involvement in ESAA district or school activities such as serving on advisory committees or volunteering in the classroom was one of the two most frequent activities (8 percent of districts with coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not provide this service). Thirty percent indicated that coordinating visitations to parents to inform them about district or school activities or policies was among the two most frequent activities of their ESAA coordinators (in 30 percent of the districts with coordinators, the coordinators did not provide this service). Twenty percent of the districts providing coordination indicated that coordinating activities for parents to train them and/or inform them about regulations and guidelines for the ESAA program was one of the two most frequent activities (13 percent of the districts with coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not provide this service).

School-Level Coordination (School-Level Questionnaire, Section E)

Nationwide, it is estimated that 36 percent of ESAA-served schools provided some school-level coordination of parental involvement activities. Among all ESAA-served schools, an average of 7.4 hours per week was spent in coordination of ESAA-related parental involvement activities.

Eleven percent of ESAA-served schools employed full-time coordinators (an average of 1.3) who contributed a total of 31 hours per week, on average, to

the coordination of ESAA parental involvement activities. Twenty-two percent of the schools employed part-time coordinators (an average of 2.7) who devoted a total of 13 hours per week, on average, to the coordination of ESAA parental involvement activities. (As with the district-level coordinators, the full-time or part-time status of these coordinators does not imply that their entire salary is paid by ESAA.)

For the schools providing ESAA parent coordination services, the respondent was asked to check off the activities engaged in by these coordinators and to indicate which two were engaged in most frequently. In 31 percent, one of the two most frequent activities was participating in meetings to inform parents about district or school activities and policies. Nine percent of the schools with coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not offer this service. In 28 percent of the schools with coordinators, visiting parents in their homes to inform them about district or school activities or policies was indicated as one of the two most frequent coordinator activities. However, 40 percent of the schools with coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not provide this service. In 14 percent of these schools recruiting parents for involvement in ESAA district or school activities (such as serving on the DAC or volunteering in a classroom) was indicated as one of the two most frequent activities of coordinators. Twenty-three percent of the schools having coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not offer this service. In only 8 percent of the schools, one of the two most frequent activities was to conduct workshops to inform parents about the regulations and guidelines for the ESAA program. Thirty-six percent of the schools with coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not offer this service.

Contrasting the school level to the district level, it seems clear that school-level coordinators were less often involved in providing information about regulations and guidelines than were district-level coordinators.

PARENT PARTICIPATION IN THE ESAA EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM (SECTIONS B, C AND D OF SCHOOL-LEVEL FPS SURVEY)

Parents can participate in the educational program in three ways: as paid paraprofessionals, as volunteers, and as instructors of their own children at home.

Section 607(b) of the Emergency School Aid Act* states that preference should be given to parents of children affected by the project in recruiting and hiring teacher aides. Based on the survey, 66 percent of schools served by ESAA employed an average of 2.5 paid paraprofessionals each. Twenty-one percent of ESAA-served schools employed an average of 1.9 parents of children enrolled at the school in some of these positions, while 14 percent employed parents of ESAA-served children (an average of 2.0 per school). Ninety-four percent of the schools employing parents provided an average of 44.8 hours per year of formal training for the paid parent para- professionals who work directly with children in the instructional process.

For each school in the survey, the respondent was requested to check off activities of paid parent paraprofessionals and mark the two engaged in most frequently. Two activities clearly stood out: 52 percent of schools with ESAA-paid parent paraprofessionals reported that one of the two most frequently engaged in activities was working with individuals or small groups, reviewing or reteaching skills and concepts they have already learned. Forty-three percent reported that giving special assistance to children with particular academic difficulties or weaknesses was one of the two activities engaged in most frequently. They also assist with non-instructional tasks (e.g., roll-taking, correcting papers, playground, field trips), and in acquisition, preparation or retrieval of instructional materials. (Together these were indicated as among the two most frequent activities by 60 percent of the schools with ESAA paid parent paraprofessionals.)

---

*Congressional Record, October 10, 1978, H12169.

The opportunity to nominate candidates for paid parent paraprofessional positions or to make the final selection could represent areas of strong parental influence on the educational process. The management activities of DACs (Table 10) suggest that little parental involvement of this type would be found, and this is, indeed, the case. A series of questions about the individuals or groups with greatest responsibility in these two areas revealed that DAC or a special hiring committee with parent members contributed to making nominations for these positions in only 4 percent of the schools. In only 3 percent of the schools did these two groups contribute to the final selection. In all of the schools having paid parent paraprofessionals, even this level of authority was shared between the parent groups and district or school professional staff.

Sixty-nine percent of the schools marked "other" for the source of nominations and 66 percent marked "other" for final selection. District officers and principals accounted for the bulk of the remainder. Parents clearly have little input in this process.

Eighteen percent of ESAA schools had a volunteer component in the ESAA project. In 17 percent of the schools parents of children currently enrolled at the school served as volunteers (an average of 11 per school). In 84 percent of the schools where parents are volunteers, formal training was provided to volunteers (an average of 16.5 hours per year).

Parent volunteers performed the same tasks as paid parent paraprofessionals. Forty-two percent of schools with parent volunteers indicated that working with individual children or small groups, reviewing or reteaching skills and concepts students have already learned was among the two most frequent activities of parent volunteers. Twenty-five percent indicated that giving special assistance to children with particular academic difficulties or weaknesses was one of the two most frequent activities of parent volunteers. Twenty-nine percent cited work in acquisition, preparation or retrieval of instructional materials while 15 percent cited relieving teachers of non-instructional tasks as among the two most frequent activities of parent volunteers.

Twenty-seven percent cited assisting in non-classroom components of the program (e.g., library, playground, field trips) and another 28 percent cited planning and/or participating in special activities with multicultural themes as among the two most frequent activities of parent volunteers.

Parent volunteers are less likely to be used in instructional roles than are paid parent paraprofessionals, but substantial numbers of parent volunteers do engage in activities that supplement the instructional program.

The survey indicates that 54 percent of ESAA-served schools tried to involve parents in the educational process as teachers for their own children at home through a diversity of activities or services provided to parents. Of the 54 percent of schools with any of these activities, 65 percent provided group training sessions, 48 percent provided workshops in which parents made educational games and/or other instructional materials, 42 percent provided individual training sessions, 35 percent sent home specially prepared materials for parents to use with their children, and 69 percent sent home written handouts (e.g., pamphlets, handbooks) intended for individual home study. The data collected in this area did not include information about the frequency or intensity of these activities, or about the costs.

FINANCING PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN ESAA PROJECTS

The expenditures associated with parental involvement activities may be accounted for in a variety of ways. Indeed, what is considered to be a part of parental involvement also varied considerably from place to place. The Federal Programs Survey asked whether or not each district used a "line item" form of accounting for parental involvement. Forty-five percent of the districts used a line item for parental involvement. Among these districts, however, there was little agreement as to what activities were included in the line item. For example, only 60 percent of the line items included advisory group meeting expenses while virtually all districts have these groups.

There is no uniformity in the manner by which LEAs keep track of parental involvement expenses. One district may cost parent paid aides under "parental involvement" while another district will locate these costs under "instruction." Accordingly, we are not able to assign any dollar amounts to the costs of parental involvement activities.

ESAA-FUNDED NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS (SECTION D OF THE DISTRICT-LEVEL QUESTIONNAIRE AND SECTION F OF THE SCHOOL-LEVEL QUESTIONNAIRE)

ESAA-funded Non-profit Organizations (NPOs) operate to support school desegregation programs, reduce minority group isolation, or aid school children in overcoming the educational disadvantages of minority group isolation. The FPS sample was designed to permit the estimation of the proportion of districts and schools served by the ESAA program that receive services provided by ESAA-funded NPOs. In addition, the survey sought information about the types of organization sponsoring the NPOs and the types of activities and services that these NPOs provided.

It is estimated that 14 percent of the ESAA-served districts received services from an NPO at the time of the survey. NPOs (at the district level) were sponsored by racial or ethnic organizations (28 percent), religious organizations (6 percent), community organizations (13 percent), cultural groups (19 percent), civic groups (19 percent), and by combinations of these types or others (of very low frequency). Forty percent indicated that parent-school liaison activities were among the two activities most frequently provided by the NPOs. Twenty percent indicated that parent counseling was one of the two most frequently provided services. Nineteen percent indicated that parent education was one of the two most frequently provided services. Services not related to parents were among the two most frequently provided in 47 percent of the districts.

The data at the school level were similar. About 14 percent of ESAA schools received services from NPOs. Among the organizations providing services to schools, 24 percent were racial or ethnic, 4 percent were religious,

4 percent were community organizations, 30 percent were cultural groups, and 4 percent were civic groups. At the school level, 17 percent of the schools indicated that parent-school liaison activities were among the two most frequent activities of NPOs. Parent conferences and parent counseling were each cited by 13 percent of the schools as among the two most frequent activities, while facilitating students' progress was cited by 10 percent of the schools and parent education was cited by 4 percent (as being among the two most frequent activities). Services not related to parents were among the two most frequently provided in 64 percent of the schools.

The ESAA-funded NPOs do not seem to provide a great deal of service related to parents. Much of the service that is provided seems directed to parental self-improvement (parent education, counseling), rather than parental involvement in the schools or districts.

CHAPTER VI. PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN PROGRAMS FUNDED BY TITLE VII OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

THE BACKGROUND OF ESEA TITLE VII

Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, often referred to as the Title VII Bilingual program, is a categorical educational program. Its target population is composed of students of limited English proficiency. Its goal is "to demonstrate effective ways of providing, for children of limited English proficiency, instruction designed to enable them, while using their native language, to achieve competence in the English language."* Projects are carried out at the district level, but students of limited English proficiency participate in their regular schools.

The Title VII Bilingual program is the third largest of the programs in the study. Given its specialized target population, the program is concentrated in locations in the nation where large proportions of students of limited English proficiency are found. While the largest number of students who participate are Hispanic, about 70 languages are included. Approximately 5 percent of the LEAs in the nation are served by this program.

THE DESIGN OF THE FEDERAL PROGRAMS SURVEY FOR TITLE VII

The sample for the Title VII Program was drawn from a population of Title VII-served districts having any grades in the range K-8 and more than five pupils per grade. The Title VII Program Office in Washington, D.C. provided a list of participating districts, including the language(s) in which services were provided. There were 510 districts in this population.

---

*Bilingual Education Act, Section 702(a), Congressional Record, October 10, 1978, H12172.

The sampling was conducted by choosing a sampling interval based on the total enrollment in grades K-8 of all served districts and selecting districts systematically using a random start.

In order to guarantee representation from all the geographic regions of the country, the population of districts was sorted into the ten Department of Education regions. In order to guarantee representation of the various languages, the population of districts was further sorted into four categories within regions:

1. Title VII services in Spanish exclusively
2. Title VII services in Spanish and other languages
3. Title VII services only in languages other than Spanish
4. Title VII services for unspecified languages

An oversample of 5 percent was selected to allow for refusals. Table 11 presents the progress of the sample from the initial draw of 107 districts to the final sample of 89 that responded to the survey.

After districts were selected, they were contacted for lists of served schools (public and private). At this point some of the initial oversample was used up: two refusals and five districts that were not funded in grades K-8 by Title VII. In the 100 districts that remained, there were 724 served schools of which 701 were public and 23 were private. At this stage, it was decided not to sample private schools participating in this program.

The next step was to sample schools from within these districts. Six districts had no schools selected (as explained in Chapter III) and were dropped from the study. This resulted in 94 districts and 236 schools being selected for participation. Four more districts (with 6 schools) refused to provide the information requested. One district did not provide direct student services and was dropped (6 schools were dropped). Three schools (in separate districts) failed to provide the information requested. The final sample was 89 districts with 221 public schools.

Table 11. Progress of the Title VII Sample

	Number of Districts
Districts Selected Initially	107
Refused to Participate	2
Not Funded by Title VII*	5
No Schools Selected	6
Refused to Fill Out Forms	4
No Direct Student Services	1
Final Sample of Districts	89

* These districts were not applying their funds to instructional programs in grades K-8. Some of these appeared to be discrepancies in the data received from the Bilingual Program Office (perhaps due to changes made after the list was delivered to SDC). Others were programs of teacher training that did not seem to be providing consistent services at particular schools and were eliminated from the sample on the grounds that they were not representative of the types of projects to be studied.

SURVEY FINDINGS

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

District-level FPS Data (Section A of the District Questionnaire, and data obtained in making up the school selection lists) indicate that in 1979 the average district that participated in the Title VII program spent $1,692 per pupil in the elementary grades. In the sample, the reported values ranged from $233 per pupil to $3,700 per pupil.* The survey indicates that Title VII

*These figures should be interpreted with caution as districts do not use uniform accounting procedures to arrive at the estimated per-pupil expenditure.

Grants to districts averaged $216,200 nationwide. In the sample, the grants ranged from $11,900 to $11,857,000.

The average Title VII project served 4.1 public schools. Thirty-one percent of the districts receiving Title I funds served non-public school students. In the sample, the number of public schools served by Title VII in a district ranged from 1 to 54.

School-level FPS Data (Sections A and G of the Title VII school-level questionnaire) indicate that in 1979 the average public school offering Title VII services in any of the grades K-8 had a total enrollment of 614 pupils and provided Title VII services to 108 of them (21 percent). In these schools, 47 percent of the pupils were considered to be low-income students while 37 percent lived with parents or guardians whose home language is not English.

Table 12 shows the estimated percentages of Title VII-served public schools in various categories of classification with respect to urban or rural location.

On the average, Title VII-served public schools have participated in the program for a total of 3.3 years and indicated that they expected to spend $34,585 of Title VII funds during the 1978-1979 year. The average expenditure of Title VII funds per served pupil is $358.

Table 13 shows the percentages of Title VII-served public schools that are participating in the three other programs that are part of this study and also participate in the Education of All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142). In addition, 49 percent of the schools receive other federal funds and 73 percent receive state categorical funds.

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN THE GOVERNANCE OF TITLE VII PROJECTS

It is important to note that the Bilingual Education Act (as amended in 1978) specifies that there are two district-level advisory groups: an Advisory Council with which the district must consult in developing the application for

Table 12. Title VII-Served Schools Classified as to Urban or Rural Location (Entries are estimated percentages of the total population of Title VII Schools.)

Location	Percentage of Schools
Large city, over 200,000 population	48
Suburb of a large city	4
Middle-size city, 50,000 to 200,000 population	12
Suburb of a middle-size city	1
Small city or town, less than 50,000 population	17
Rural area near a large or middle-size city	6
Rural area, not near a large or middle-size city	13

Table 13. Estimated Percentages of Schools Served by Title VII and by Other Specific Federal Programs

Served by Title VII, I and by:	Percentage of Schools
The Emergency School Aid Act	12
Follow Through	1
ESEA Title I	73
PL 94-142 (Education for All Handicapped)	56
None of the above in addition to Title VII	10

Note: The percentages add to more than 100 because of the overlap in the categories, especially involving PL 94-142 and Title I. Only one school in the sample was funded by all programs.

a program of bilingual education; and an Advisory Committee that is to consult with the district after the application has been approved. Since the FPS questionnaire focused on the Advisory Committee, the language of the legislation is included here to make clear the mandate for this body:

> An Application for a program of bilingual education shall...(iii) contain assurances that, after the application has been approved, the applicant will provide for the continuing consultation with, and participation by, the committee of parents, teachers, and other interested individuals (of which a majority shall be parents of children of limited English proficiency) which shall be selected by and predominantly composed of parents of children participating in the program, and in the case of programs carried out in secondary schools, representatives of the secondary students to be served.*

District-Level Title VII Parent Advisory Committees (District-Level Questionnaire, Section C)

The survey data concentrate on the characteristics of the voting members of the federally mandated District-Level Community Advisory Committees (CACs). Information about the total size of the district-level CAC was not collected. It is estimated that 21 percent of Title VII-served districts did not have a district-level CAC at the time of the survey.

The average district-level CAC, nationwide, is estimated to have had 15.2 voting members of whom 13.2 were parents and 11.7 were parents of children served by Title VII. Another perspective on these findings shows that in 66 percent of the Title VII district-level CACs the voting members were exclusively parents, and in 43 percent of them the voting members were exclusively parents of children served by Title VII. Fewer than 10 percent of the districts have CACs in which parents of served children constituted less than 51 percent of the voting membership. Twenty-eight percent of the districts

*Bilingual Education Act, Section 703(a), Congressional Record, October 10, 1978, H12173.

allowed school professional personnel to hold voting memberships on the CAC and 17 percent allowed paid aides this privilege. Twenty-one percent of the district CACs allowed representatives of non-public schools to hold voting memberships.* Students had voting memberships on 18 percent of the CACs.

In 99 percent of all district-level Title VII CACs, parents of Title VII-served children had voting memberships. In about 47 percent of these CACs, all parents of served children were elected, in 18 percent they were all appointed, and in 33 percent they all volunteered to serve. The remainder selected parents of served children by more than one of the means listed above. Parents of non-Title VII students attending schools in the district held voting memberships in 62 percent of the district-level CACs in which they participated (about 51 percent of the district-level CACs). In 71 percent of these CACs the parent voting members all volunteered to serve, in 6 percent they were all appointed, and in 14 percent they were all elected.

The FPS data indicate that in 77 percent of the districts, a member may serve on the district-level CAC for an unrestricted number of consecutive terms of office. In an additional 17 percent of the districts, a member may serve for at least two consecutive terms of office. This indicates that most districts have allowed for continuing participation of CAC members, provided that they are reelected, reappointed or volunteer to serve again.

The average Title VII district-level CAC is estimated to have held 6.3 formal business meetings during the 1978-1979 school year. Two of the critical activities associated with conducting formal meetings of the district-level CAC that were examined are: presiding at the CAC meeting and setting the CAC meeting agenda.

---

*Some of these percentages represent double counts, e.g., a parent paid aide would be counted as a voting parent and as a voting paid aide. The districts consider these people to represent both categories and would not assign them exclusively to one or the other.

In 58 percent of the districts, the CAC chairperson and/or another PAC member chaired the formal meetings of the district-level CAC, while in 16 percent the Project Director and/or the Parent Coordinator chaired these meetings. In 20 percent of the districts, the Project Director and CAC chairperson shared this role. The remainder utilized other combinations of people to perform this function.

Setting the agenda for formal CAC meetings involves more people, in a greater variety of combinations, than does presiding at the meetings. It was estimated that: in 9 percent of the districts the Project Director and/or Parent Coordinator set the agenda without the assistance of a CAC member; in 19 percent of the districts, the CAC chairperson or other CAC member set the agenda without the assistance of either the Project Director or the Parent Coordinator; in 72 percent of the districts, the Project Director and/or Parent Coordinator shared the agenda setting with the CAC chairperson or other CAC members.

Project personnel (either the Project Director or the Parent Coordinator) seem to chair meetings in a modest fraction of the districts and set the agendas in a small fraction. This does not mean that parental input is ignored or rejected in these districts, but it does mean that parents have not achieved a working parity with project personnel in the running of Community Advisory Committees in these districts.

Another important aspect of the governance of Title VII projects at the district level has to do with the level of authority the district CAC has with respect to various management activities. Table 14 presents a tabulation of the percentages of Title VII district-level CACs that were estimated to have each of the four levels of authority listed (column headings).

Developing the project application was reported as the activity in which Title VII district-level CACs had the greatest authority. Since the legislation states that the Advisory Council (rather than the Advisory Committee)

Table 14. Level of Authority of Title VII District-Level CACs in Various Management Activities
(Entries are estimated percentages of all Title VII district-level CACs.)

	CAC has no advisory or decision-making role and no responsibility or no opportunity for involvement.	CAC advises the LEA in making decisions; LEA has sole decision-making responsibility.	Decision-making responsibility is jointly shared by CAC and LEA.	CAC has exclusive or principal decision-making authority.
Develop Project Application	0	62	38	0
Conduct Needs Assessment	6	67	28	0
Plan Project Components	14	63	23	0
Establish Project Objectives	2	49	48	0
Monitor Implementation	6	56	37	0
Evaluate Meeting of Goals	11	55	34	0
Review PI Budget	8	52	40	0
Review Project Budget	17	58	24	1
Sign Off PI Budget	26	48	25	0
Sign Off Project Budget	40	47	12	0
Establish Requirements for Hiring Parents	45	42	12	0
Select Project Professionals	62	31	6	1
Select Project Paraprofessionals	68	26	6	0
Evaluate Project Professionals	64	26	9	1
Evaluate Project Paraprofessionals	63	27	10	0
Handle Complaints	30	41	23	6

Note: The row labels in this table are shortened versions of the row labels used in the Title VII district-level questionnaire, question C-12.

should advise about the project application, this result seems ambiguous. It is likely to indicate that some districts rename the Council to be the Committee upon approval of the application. Data on this phenomenon were anecdotal and do not provide a basis for estimating the frequency with which it occurs.

The CACs' level of authority was less with respect to management operations such as needs assessments and evaluations and even less still in areas having to do with budget. Activities having to do with personnel seem to have been outside the authority of the Title VII CACs altogether at the time of the survey.

Only 20 percent of the district-level CACs had subcommittees that meet regularly for the purpose of handling CAC business. The most frequently occurring subcommmittee (15 percent of all CACs) dealt with management functions such as budget, personnel or evaluation. These relatively small percentages suggest that regular subcommittees do not account for very much parental involvement in governance that is not represented in the findings presented for the entire CACs. Had subcommittees occurred with greater frequency, it would have been necessary to account for their activity more fully in assessing the overall level of parental involvement in governance at the district level.

One measure of the support for CACs is the budget that is allowed for its operating expenses and activities, and the proportion of that budget that it controls. Forty-nine percent of the CACs had a budget. The average budget was $2,066 per year.

Only 38 percent of these district-level CACs were able to use any of this money at their own discretion. However, in these CACs (about 19 percent of all Title VII CACs) the entire budget was for use at the CAC's discretion in almost all cases.

Because parent members of CACs might be expected to speak a language other than English, the FPS questionnaire sought to determine the proportion of CACs that held meetings in other languages, especially Spanish. Twenty-one percent of CACs did not hold meetings in English. Forty-two percent held meetings in Spanish and English simultaneously while 17 percent held meetings in Spanish, English and other languages simultaneously. Only 7 percent used English alone. Thirteen percent used English and other (not Spanish) languages simultaneously.

Voting members of CAC may also become involved with advisory committees at the school level. The FPS data indicate that on average, 7.7 of the voting members of the district-level CAC served on a school-level advisory committee. Twenty-two percent of CACs had no voting members who were also members of school-level committees. Twenty-three percent of CACs were composed solely of school-level committee members. The districts reported that 39 percent of their Title VII-served schools had advisory committees.

From the FPS sample of schools, it is estimated that 42 percent of the schools had a Title VII Advisory Committee at the school-level. Parents of served children held voting memberships in 98 percent of the school CACs. In 29 percent of the schools, all of these parents volunteered to serve on the CAC; in 4 percent they were all appointed, and in 59 percent they were all elected. Parents of children not served by Title VII were given voting memberships in 41 percent of the school CACs. In 62 percent of these schools all non-Title VII parents were volunteers and in another 33 percent, they were all elected. In the remaining 5 percent, they were either appointed or chosen by a combination of election, appointment and volunteerism.

COORDINATION OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

District-Level Coordination (District-Level Questionnaire, Section B)

Nationwide, it is estimated that 83 percent of Title VII districts provided some district-level coordination of parental involvement activities in the Title VII program. Among all Title VII-served districts, an average

of 21.1 hours per week were spent in coordination of parental involvement activities related to the Title VII program.

Thirty-one percent of the districts participating in the Title VII program employed full-time coordinators who devoted some of their time to the coordination of Title VII parental involvement activities. (They were not necessarily full-time employees of the Title VII project alone.) These districts employed an average of 1.3 such coordinators who devoted an average of 41.6 hours per week to the coordination of Title VII parental involvement activities.

Seventy-six percent of the Title VII-served districts employed part-time coordinators (an average of 2.1) who devoted a total of 10.7 hours per week, on average, to the coordination of Title VII parental involvement activities. (Again, these coordinators may have been paid by other sources in addition to Title VII.)

The districts providing Title VII parent coordination services were asked to check off the activites engaged in by their coordinators, and to indicate which two were engaged in most frequently. Forty-six percent of the districts providing coordination indicated that coordinating activities for parents to train them and/or inform them about regulations and guidelines for the Title VII program was one of the two most frequent activities (3 percent of the districts with coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not provide this service). Twenty-eight percent of these districts indicated that attending meetings to inform parents about district or school activities or policies was one of the two most frequent activities (all districts having coordinators provided this service). An additional 28 percent of districts reported that coordinating visitations to parents to inform them about district or school activities or policies was among the two most frequent activities (13 percent of districts with coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not offer this service, however).

Thirty percent of the districts providing coordination indicated that recruiting parents for involvement in Title VII district or school activities, such as serving on advisory committees or volunteering in the classroom, was one of the two most frequent activities (10 percent of districts with coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not provide this service).

School-Level Coordination (School-Level Questionnaire, Section E)

Nationwide, it is estimated that 48 percent of schools participating in Title VII provided some school-level coordination of parental involvement activities. Among all Title VII-served schools, an average of 7.0 hours per week were spent in coordination of Title VII-related parental involvement activities.

Fifteen percent of Title VII-served schools employed full-time coordinators (an average of 1.1) who contributed a total of 21.8 hours per week, on average, to the coordination of Title VII parental involvement activities. Forty-three percent of these schools employed part-time coordinators (an average of 1.9) who devoted a total of 8.6 hours per week, on average, to the coordination of Title VII parental involvement activiites. (As with the district-level coordinators, the full-time or part-time status of these coordinators does not imply that their entire salary is paid by Title VII.)

For the schools providing Title VII parent coordination services, the respondent was asked to check off the activities engaged in by these coordinators and to indicate which two were engaged in most frequently. In 26 percent of these schools, recruiting parents for involvement in Title VII district or school activities (such as serving on a CAC or volunteering in the classroom) was indicated as one of the two most frequent activities of coordinators. Eight percent of the schools having coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not offer this service. In 34 percent, one of the two most frequent activities was participating in meetings to inform parents about district or school activities and policies. Three percent of the schools with coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not offer this service. In

30 percent of the schools, one of the two most frequent activities was to coordinate visitations to parents to inform them about district or school activities or policies. Twenty-four percent of the schools with coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not offer this service. Only 9 percent of these schools reported that coordinating activities for parents to train them or inform them about regulations and guidelines was one of the two most important coordinator activities.

Contrasting the school level to the district level, it seems clear that school-level coordinators were less often involved in providing information about regulations and guidelines than were district-level coordinators.

PARENT PARTICIPATION IN THE TITLE VII EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM (SECTIONS B, C AND D OF SCHOOL-LEVEL FPS SURVEY)

Parents can participate in the educational program in three ways: as paid paraprofessionals, as volunteers, and as instructors of their own children at home.

Based on the survey, 87 percent of schools served by Title VII employed an average of 2.8 paid paraprofessionals each. Twenty-four percent of Title VII-served schools employed an average of 1.7 parents of children enrolled at the school in some of these positions, and 18 percent employed parents of Title VII-served children (an average of 1.6 per school). Ninety-three percent of the schools employing parents provided formal training in either bilingual education or other aspects of their duties to the paid parent paraprofessionals who work directly with children in the instructional process. An average of 40 hours per year of training in bilingual education and 34 hours per year of training in other matters was provided.

For each school in the survey, the respondent was requested to check off activities of paid parent paraprofessionals and mark the two engaged in most frequently. Two activities clearly stood out: 80 percent of schools with Title VII-paid parent paraprofessionals reported that one of the two most

frequently engaged in activities was working with individual children or small groups, reviewing or reteaching skills and concepts they have already learned. Sixty-five percent reported that working with individual children or small groups on activities designed to improve their English-speaking abilities was one of the two activities engaged in most frequently.

The opportunity to nominate candidates for paid parent paraprofessional positions or to make the final selection could represent areas of strong parental influence on the educational process. The management activities of CACs (Table 14) suggest that little parental involvement of this type would be found and this is, indeed, the case. A series of questions about the individuals or groups with greatest responsibility in these two areas revealed that CAC or a special hiring committee with parent members contributed to making nominations for these positions in only 3 percent of the schools. In only 1 percent of the schools did these two groups contribute to the final selection. Even this level of authority was shared by the parent groups and district or school professional staff. Parents clearly have little input in this process.

Thirty-two percent of Title VII-served schools had a volunteer component in the Title VII project. In 28 percent of the schools, parents of children currently enrolled at the school served as volunteers (an average of 10.1 per school). In 69 percent of the schools where parents are volunteers, formal training was provided to volunteers (an average of 19 hours per year of formal training in bilingual education and 15 hours per year of formal training in other aspects of their duties). The other 31 percent of the schools provided no training for volunteers.

Parent volunteers performed tasks similar to those of paid parent paraprofessionals. Thirty-four percent of schools with parent volunteers indicated that working with individual children or small groups, reviewing or reteaching skills and concepts students have already learned was among the two most frequent activities of parent volunteers. Forty-seven percent indicated that working with individual children or small groups on activities designed to

improve their English speaking abilities was one of the two most frequent activities of parent volunteers. Forty-five percent cited enriching the curriculum in areas requiring special skills or unique experiences (e.g., bicultural activities) as among the two most frequent activities of parent volunteers.

Parent volunteers are less likely to be used in academically-oriented instructional roles than are paid parent paraprofessionals, but substantial numbers of parent volunteers do engage in activities that supplement the instructional program.

The survey indicates that 74 percent of Title VII-served schools tried to involve parents in the educational process as teachers for their own children at home through a diversity of activities or services provided to parents. Of the 74 percent of schools with any of these activities, 67 percent provided group training sessions, 67 percent provided workshops in which parents made educational games and/or other instructional materials, 38 percent provided individual training sessions, 73 percent sent home specially prepared materials for parents to use with their children and 64 percent sent home written handouts (e.g., pamphlets, handbooks) intended for individual home study. The data collected in this area did not include information about the frequency or intensity of these activities, or about the costs.

FINANCING PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN TITLE VII PROJECTS

The expenditures associated with parental involvement activities may be accounted for in a variety of ways. Indeed, what is considered to be a part of parental involvement also varied considerably from place to place. The Federal Programs Survey asked whether or not each district used a "line item" form of accounting for parental involvement. Sixty-five percent of the districts used a line item for parental involvement. Among these districts, however, there was little agreement as to what activities were included in

the line item. For example, among districts having line items and advisory committees, only 40 percent of the line items included advisory group meeting expenses.

There is no uniformity in the manner by which LEAs keep track of parental involvement expenses. One district may cost parent paid aides under "parental involvement" while another district will locate these costs under "instruction." Accordingly, we are not able to assign any dollar amounts to the costs of parental involvement activities.

CHAPTER VII. PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN PROGRAMS FUNDED BY FOLLOW THROUGH

THE BACKGROUND OF FOLLOW THROUGH

Follow Through is an anti-poverty program. Its target population is composed of students who are at or below the poverty level and who have participated in Head Start or a similar preschool program. (Students above the poverty level may participate in a Follow Through project, as long as they are supported by local educational agency funds or their families pay for their participation.) Its goal is to sustain and expand, during grades kindergarten through three, gains students have made in their preschool programs. A project is composed of one or more schools implementing a particular Follow Through instructional approach. Follow Through is the smallest of the four subject programs, there being only 137 districts participating in the program.

PAST RESEARCH ON PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN FOLLOW THROUGH PROJECTS

The various volumes from the national evaluation of Follow Through have little to say about parental involvement, perhaps because the focus was on comparisons among the different Follow Through models. Other studies have provided some information. For example, Nero and Associates (1976), in a study based on brief visits to ten Follow Through sites, reported that a key element in facilitating the development of parental participation was the employment of a person at a Follow Through school in the role of a Parent Coordinator. This person was found to ease the contact between the school and the parent, and to facilitate communication at a personal rather than formal level. The Nero study also found that the presence of classroom aides helped make parents feel more comfortable in interacting with the school, as did home visits by the Parent Coordinator; that parents became involved in decision making when they perceived that their participation would be meaningful; that there was a tendency for more involvement when students are in the primary grades than later; and that middle-class, better educated parents tended to be more involved than lower-income parents.

Haney and Pennington (1978) reported on an analysis of 3,911 parent interviews (sampled from some 60,000 collected, but little analysed, during the national evaluation). The focus of this analysis was upon the comparison of Follow Through parents with parents of similar background who were not participating in the Follow Through program. Haney and Pennington concluded that Follow Through parents were more likely than their non-Follow Through peers: 1) to be aware of and participate in advisory group activities; 2) to feel that parents can influence the way the school is run; 3) to work in a classroom at school; 4) to visit classrooms; and 5) to have a teacher visit them at home. Olmstead and Rubin (1980) document aspects of parental involvement related to these findings for some of the Follow Through models.

Rehab Group, Inc. (1980) reported on a study of the Supplemental Training component of the Follow Through program. This component, for which Follow Through no longer provides funding, was intended to provide training and job opportunities for low income parents and school aides. The report concluded that participation in the Supplemental Training component did improve the employment prospects of the participants, although some of the improvement may have been due to other influences of the Follow Through program.

THE DESIGN OF THE FEDERAL PROGRAMS SURVEY FOR FOLLOW THROUGH

The sample for the Follow Through Program was drawn from a population of districts having any grades in the range K-8 and more than five pupils per grade. The sample was selected from a population of all the districts participating in Follow Through that was provided by the Follow Through office in Washington, D.C. There were 137 districts in this population.

The structure of the Follow Through program is different than that of the other programs under study. Follow Through operates on a project, rather than a district, basis. The goal of the sampling was to obtain a representative sample of projects and schools, which was accomplished with a slight modification of the sampling strategy used for the other programs (see Chapter III).

Of the 137 districts in the program, four had more than one project in operation at the time of the survey. These districts were large enough that they came into the sample with certainty. (That is, using any random start for the systematic sampling these districts would always have been been chosen because their size measure was larger than the sampling interval.) These districts were asked to provide lists of participating schools identified by project. When the school-level sample was drawn, the projects associated with the sampled schools were identified and the project directors each received project-level questionnaires. The net effect of this strategy was that in each of two of the sample districts the FPS obtained information about two projects rather than one.

Most Follow Through projects are run in accordance with a "model" provided by a sponsoring agency (often a university or an educational research and development laboratory); however, some are parent sponsored, and some are district sponsored (called "self-sponsored"). While the Follow Through regulations concerning parental involvement are the most wide-ranging and specific of all of the four programs studied, the sponsors' models do vary in their emphasis on parental involvement.

In order to represent this variation in the sample, participating districts were organized into five groups, representing an ordering of the sponsor's emphasis on parental involvement (a list identifying the districts in this fashion was obtained from the Follow Through Office):

1. Districts with projects run by sponsors whose models place relatively heavy emphasis on parental involvement

2. Districts with projects sponsored by parents

3. Districts with projects run by sponsors whose models place relatively moderate emphasis on parental involvement

4. Districts with projects run by sponsors whose models place relatively little emphasis on parental involvement

5. Districts with projects which are self-sponsored, whose emphasis on parental involvement is not known

Within each of the ten Department of Education geographical regions, the districts were organized by level of emphasis on parental involvement. The actual sampling was conducted by choosing a sampling interval based on the total enrollment in grades K-8 of all served districts and selecting districts systematically using a random start. An oversample of 5 percent was chosen to allow for refusals.

Table 15 presents the progress of the sample from the initial draw of 70 districts to the final sample of 64 (with 66 projects) that responded to the survey. After districts were selected, they were contracted for lists of served schools (public and private). At this point, one district refused to participate. In the 69 districts that remained, there were 268 served schools of which 265 were public and three were private. It was decided not to include private schools in the sample.

Table 15. Progress of the Follow Through Sample

	Number of Districts
Districts Selected Initially	70
Refused to Participate	1
No Schools Selected	4
Refused to Fill Out Forms	1
Final Sample of Districts	64

The next step was to sample schools from within these districts. Four districts had no schools selected (as explained in Chapter III) and were dropped from the study. This resulted in 65 districts and 165 schools being selected for participation. One more district (with three schools) refused to provide the information requested. In addition, one school in another district would not cooperate. The final sample was 64 districts (66 projects) with 161 public schools.

SURVEY FINDINGS

PROJECT AND SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Project-level FPS data (Section A of the project Questionnaire, and data obtained in making up the school selection lists) indicate that in 1979, the average district that participated in the Follow Through program spent $1,402 per pupil in the elementary grades. In the sample, the reported values ranged from $618 per pupil to $2,700 per pupil.* The survey indicates that Follow Through grants to districts averaged $352,000 nationwide. In the sample, the grants ranged from $55,200 to $1,783,000.

The average Follow Through project served 3.3 public schools and no private schools. Eleven percent of the Follow Through projects served non-public school students. In the sample, the number of public schools served by Follow Through ranged from 1 to 15.

School-level FPS data (Sections A and F of the school-level questionnaire) indicate that in 1979 the average public school offering Follow Through services had a total K-3 enrollment of 293 pupils and provided Follow Through

*These figures should be interpreted with caution as districts do not use uniform accounting procedures to arrive at the estimated per-pupil expenditure.

services to 190 of them (74 percent). In these schools, 74 percent of the pupils were considered to be low-income students while 11 percent lived with parents or guardians whose home language is not English.

Table 16 shows the estimated percentages of Follow Through public schools in various categories of classification with respect to urban or rural location.

On the average, Follow Through public schools have participated in the program for a total of 9.6 years and indicated that they expected to spend $95,500 of Follow Through funds during the 1978-1979 year. The average expenditure of Follow Through funds per served pupil is $552. (Projects were not asked to separately record funds for direct services or funds for services provided through sponsors.)

Table 17 shows the percentages of Follow Through public schools that are participating in the three other programs that are part of this study and also participate in the Education of All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142). In addition, 54 percent of the schools receive other federal funds and 71 percent receive state categorical funds.

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN THE GOVERNANCE OF FOLLOW THROUGH PROJECTS

Parents may participate in the governance of Follow Through projects at the project level by becoming members of the federally mandated advisory council, the Policy Advisory Committee. This section of the Follow Through chapter deals with these PACs.

The legislation for Follow Through is not very specific about the roles that parents may play in the governance of projects, stating that "projects will provide for the direct participation of the parents (of served children) in the development, conduct, and overall direction of the program at the local level." (Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as amended by PL95-568.) The

Table 16. Follow Through-Served Schools Classified as to Urban or Rural Location
(Entries are estimated percentages of the total population of Follow Through schools.)

Location	Percentage of Schools
Large city, over 200,000 population	30
Suburb of a large city	2
Middle-size city, 50,000 to 200,000 population	18
Suburb of a middle-size city	1
Small city or town, less than 50,000 population	17
Rural area near a large or middle-size city	6
Rural area, not near a large or middle-size city	27

Table 17. Estimated Percentages of Schools Served by Follow Through and by Other Specific Federal Programs

Served by Follow Through and by:	Percentage of Schools
The Emergency School Aid Act	16
ESEA Title I	98
ESEA Title VII Bilingual	13
PL 94-142 (Education for All Handicapped)	84
None of the above in addition to Follow Through	1

Note: The percentages add to more than 100 because of the overlap in the categories, especially involving PL 94-142 and ESEA Title I. Only one school in the sample was funded by all programs.

regulations, however, are much more detailed. Some relevant excerpts are provided below:

a) Purpose. Each grantee shall, upon the identification of Follow Through project children, establish a Policy Advisory Committee, selected in accordance with paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section, to assist with the planning and operation of project activities and to actively participate in decision making concerning these activities.

b) Membership.

1) More than one-half of the Policy Advisory Committee members shall be low-income Follow Through parents who are elected (or reelected) by such parents in elections held at least annually.

2) The remaining members shall be chosen by the parent members, elected under paragraph b)1) of this section from among the various persons and representatives of agencies and organizations in the community who have manifested concern in the interests of low-income persons.

3) In no case shall an officer of the Policy Advisory Committee serve for more than two consecutive years as an officer.

c) Duties. The Policy Advisory Committee's duties shall include: (1) developing by-laws which define the purposes and procedures of the Committee; (2) helping to develop all components of the project proposal and approving them in their final form; (3) assisting in the development of criteria for selection of professional staff and recommending the selection of such staff; (4) assisting in the development of criteria for the selection of non-professional and paraprofessional staff, exercising primary responsibility in recommending the selection of such staff for participation in the project; (5) exercising the primary role in developing criteria for selection and recruiting of eligible children; (6) contributing to the continued effectiveness of the project coordinator; (7) establishing and operating a procedure of petition and discussion under which complaints of parents and other interested persons can be promptly and fairly considered; (8) mobilizing community resources and

securing the active participation of Follow Through parents in the projects; (9) supervising a Career Development Committee to provide direction and initiative for the career development component.*

Project-Level Follow Through Policy Advisory Committees (Project-level Questionnaire, Secton C)

The survey data concentrate on the characteristics of the voting members of the Project-Level Parent Advisory Councils (PACs). Information about the total size of the PAC was not collected.

In our sample, all of the projects indicated that they had project-level PACs. The average project-level PAC, nationwide, is estimated to have had 36.8 voting members of whom 32.4 were parents and 31.4 were parents of children served by Follow Through.

Another perspective on these findings shows that in 58 percent of the Follow Through PACs, the voting members were exclusively parents, and in 47 percent of them, the voting members were exclusively parents of children served by Follow Through. One percent of the projects have PACs in which parents of served children constituted less than 51 percent of the voting membership. Fifteen percent of the projects allowed school professional personnel to hold voting memberships on the PAC and 11 percent allowed paid aides this privilege. Six percent of the district PACs allowed representatives of non-public schools to hold voting memberships.** Thirty-seven percent allowed community representatives to hold voting memberships.

*Rules and Regulations for the Follow Through Program, Section 158.19, Federal Register, Vol. 42, No. 125, June 29, 1977, page 33149.

**Some of these percentages represent double counts, e.g., a parent paid aide would be counted as a voting parent and as a voting paid aide. The districts consider these people to represent both categories and would not assign them exclusively to one or the other.

Parents of Follow Through served children had voting memberships on all PACs. In about 86 percent of these PACs, all served parents were elected, and in 8 percent, they all volunteered to serve. The remainder used election, appointment and volunteerism to place parents of served children on the PAC. Parents of non-Follow Through students attending schools in the district held voting memberships in 44 percent of the district-level PACs in which they participated (about 54 percent of PACs). In 26 percent of PACs with non-Follow Through parent voting members, they all volunteered to serve, in another 26 percent, they were all appointed, and in 47 percent they were all elected.

The FPS data indicate that in 25 percent of the projects, a member may serve on the PAC for an unrestricted number of consecutive terms of office. In an additional 61 percent of the projects, a member may serve for at least two consecutive terms of office. This indicates that most districts have allowed for continuing participation of PAC members, provided that they are reelected, reappointed or volunteer to serve again.

The average Follow Through PAC is estimated to have held ten formal business meetings during the 1978-1979 school year. Two of the critical activities associated with conducting formal meetings of the PAC that were examined are presiding at the PAC meeting and setting the PAC meeting agenda.

In 85 percent of the districts, the PAC chairperson and/or another PAC member chaired the formal meetings of the PAC, while in 1 percent the Project Director and/or the Parent Coordinator chaired these meetings. In 14 percent of the districts, the Project Director or Parent Coordinator shared this role with the PAC chairperson or other PAC member.

Setting the agenda for formal PAC meetings involves more people, in a greater variety of combinations, than does presiding at the meetings. It was estimated that: in 17 percent of the projects, the Project Director and/or Parent Coordinator set the agenda without the assistance of a PAC member; in 13 percent of the projects, the PAC chairperson or other PAC member set the agenda

without the assistance of either the Project Director or the Parent Coordinator; in 70 percent of the projects, the Project Director and/or Parent Coordinator shared the agenda setting with the PAC chairperson or other PAC members.

Project personnel (either the Project Director or the Parent Coordinator) seem to control the agenda-setting function in a modest fraction of the projects. This does not mean that parental input is ignored or rejected, but it does mean that parents have not achieved a working parity with project personnel in the setting of agendas in these districts.

Another important aspect of the governance of Follow Through projects at the district level has to do with the level of authority the PAC has with respect to various management activities. Table 18 presents a tabulation of the percentages of Follow Through PACs that were reported to have each of the four levels of authority listed (column headings).

Developing the project application, establishing project objectives and approving the parental involvement budget are the activities in which Follow Through PACs had the greatest authority. Their level of authority was less with respect to management operations such as evaluations and even less still in areas having to do with overall project budget. Among activities having to do with personnel, many Follow Through PACs played an active role in the selection and evaluation of project paraprofessionals, but had little say about project professionals.

Consistent with the relatively large size of Follow Through PACs and their level of activity, 91 percent of the PACs had subcommittees that met regularly for the purpose of handling PAC business. The most frequently occurring subcommittee (85 percent of all projects) dealt with management functions such as budget, personnel or evaluation. Forty-four percent of all project PACs had a subcommittee to deal with parent education in areas not related to their work in instructing children. Fifty-six percent of all project PACs had a subcommittee to direct its own operations (i.e., a steering committee).

Table 18. Level of Authority of Follow Through PACs in Various Management Activities
(Entries are estimated percentages of all Follow Through PACs.)

	PAC has no advisory or decision-making role and no responsibility or no opportunity for involvement.	PAC advises the LEA in making decisions; LEA has sole decision-making responsibility.	Decision-making responsibility is jointly shared by PAC and LEA.	PAC has exclusive or principal decision-making authority.
Develop Project Application	0	22	58	20
Plan Project Components	0	41	37	21
Establish Project Objectives	1	24	59	16
Monitor Implementation	4	29	54	13
Evaluate Meeting of Goals	1	38	46	15
Review PI Budget	0	18	34	48
Review Project Budget	3	34	43	20
Sign Off PI Budget	0	6	50	44
Sign Off Project Budget	6	28	48	18
Establish Requirements for Hiring Parents	2	23	58	18
Select Project Professionals	14	55	16	15
Select Project Paraprofessionals	3	29	51	16
Evaluate Project Professionals	53	38	8	1
Evaluate Project Paraprofessionals	43	21	34	2
Handle Complaints	10	33	43	14

Note: The row labels in this table are shortened versions of the row labels used in the Follow Through project-level questionnaire, question C-11.

The mandate in the rules and regulations is reflected in the extensive use of subcommittees and in the levels of authority attained by the PACs. However, some of the statements of specific duties might lead one to expect even more authority to be invested in PACs, on average. For example, PACs are to exercise primary responsibility in recommending selection of paraprofessional staff, yet only 16 percent of PACs have the exclusive or principal decision-making authority to select these people. PACs are to establish and operate a procedure for handling complaints, yet only 14 percent have exclusive or principal decision-making authority in this area. These differences between expectations and the reported performance rest on nuances of meaning that cannot be resolved within the framework of this report. The intent of the regulation writers may not have been fairly represented by the manner in which the FPS posed these issues, and the apparent discrepancy may not represent a shortcoming of the program.

One measure of the support for the PAC is the budget that is allowed for its operating expenses and activities, and the proportion of that budget that it controls. The Follow Through regulations are quite specific concerning the provision of a budget to enable each PAC to accomplish its mandate (set forth earlier):

> 1) In order to facilitate the functioning of the Policy Advisory Committee, i) the committee shall submit a proposed budget of its projected operational costs for each budget period to the grantee for inclusion in the grantee's application, and...shall at the beginning of each grant period allocate to the Committee a sum sufficient to allow it effectively to fulfill its responsibilities....*

*Rules and Regulations for the Follow Through Program, Section 158.19(e), Federal Register, Vol. 42, No. 125, June 29, 1977, page 33150.

Ninety-eight percent of the PACs had a budget. The average budget was $2,655 per year. Eighty-nine percent of these PACs were able to use some of this money at their own discretion, and in 82 percent the entire budget was for use at the PAC's discretion.

Voting members of the PAC may also become involved with advisory committees at the school level. The FPS data indicate that, on average, 29.5 of the PAC's voting members served on school advisory committees also. Thirty percent of the projects did not have school-level advisory committees. In 60 percent of the projects, the PAC was composed exclusively of members of school-level advisory committees.

The respondents to the project-level FPS indicated that, on average, 67 percent of the served schools had an advisory committee. From the school sample, it was estimated that 71 percent of the schools had such committees.

Parents of served children held voting memberships in 99 percent of the school committees. In 18 percent of the schools, all served parents volunteered to serve on the committee, and in 79 percent, they were all elected. Parents of children not served by Follow Through were given voting memberships in 44 percent of the school committees. In 22 percent of these schools, all non-Follow Through parents were volunteers and in another 72 percent all were elected. In the remaining 6 percent they were all appointed.

COORDINATION OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

District-Level Coordination (District-Level Questionnaire, Section B)

Nationwide, it is estimated that 92 percent of Follow Through projects provided some district-level coordination of parental involvement activities in the Follow Through program. Among all Follow Through projects, an average of 78.6 hours per week was spent in coordination of parental involvement activities related to the Follow Through program.

Eighty-four percent of Follow Through projects employed full-time coordinators who devoted some of their time to the coordination of Follow Through parental involvement activities. (They were not necessarily full-time employees of the Follow Through project alone.) These projects employed an average of 2.3 such coordinators who devoted an average of 78.4 hours per week to the coordination of Follow Through parental involvement activities.

Sixty percent of the Follow Through projects employed part-time coordinators (an average of 2.4) who devoted a total of 20.5 hours per week, on average, to the coordination of Follow Through parental involvement activities. (Again, these coordinators may have been paid from other sources in addition to Follow Through.)

The projects providing Follow Through parent coordination services were asked to check off the activities engaged in by their coordinators, and to indicate which two were engaged in most frequently. Thirty-nine percent of these projects indicated that coordinating activities for parents to train them and/or inform them about regulations and guidelines for the Follow Through program was one of the two most frequent activities (3 percent of the projects with coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not provide this service). Thirty-six percent of the projects providing coordination indicated that recruiting parents for involvement in Follow Through district or school activities such as serving on advisory committees or volunteering in the classroom was one of the two most frequent activities (10 percent of projects with coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not provide this service). Thirty-one percent of the projects reported that coordinating visitations to parents to inform them about district or school activities or policies was among the two most frequent activities (7 percent of the projects with coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not offer this service).

School-Level Coordination (School-Level Questionnaire, Section E)

Nationwide, it is estimated that 81 percent of Follow Through schools provided some school-level coordination of parental involvement activities. Among all

Follow Through schools, an average of 26.2 hours per week are spent in coordination of Follow Through-related parental involvement activities.

Forty-four percent of Follow Through-served schools employed full-time coordinators (an average of 1.3) who contributed a total of 36.8 hours per week, on average, to the coordination of Follow Through parental involvement activities. Fifty-four percent of the schools employed part-time coordinators (an average of 4.7) who devoted a total of 18.9 hours per week, on average, to the coordination of Follow Through parental involvement activities. (As with the district-level coordinators, the full-time or part-time status of these coordinators does not imply that their entire salary is paid by Follow Through.)

For the schools providing Follow Through parent coordination services, the respondent was asked to check off the activities engaged in by these coordinators and to indicate which two were engaged in most frequently. In 48 percent of these schools recruiting parents for involvement in Follow Through project or school activities (such as serving on a PAC or volunteering in the classroom) was indicated as one of the two most frequent activities of coordinators. Twenty-one percent of the schools having coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not offer this service. In 47 percent, one of the two most frequent activities was coordinating visitations to parents to inform them about district or school activities and policies. Seven percent of the schools with coordinators indicated that their coordinators did not offer this service.

Contrasting the school level to the project level, it seems clear that school-level coordinators were more often concerned with recruiting parents to participate in the program and were less often involved in providing information about regulations and guidelines than were project-level coordinators.

PARENT PARTICIPATION IN THE FOLLOW THROUGH EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM (SECTIONS B, C AND D OF SCHOOL-LEVEL FPS SURVEY)

Parents can participate in the educational program in three ways: as paid paraprofessionals, as volunteers, and as instructors of their own children

at home. With respect to paid paraprofessionals and volunteers, the regulations state:

> Whenever an opening exists in project staff positions for non-professionals or paraprofessionals, the grantee shall actively solicit applications from low-income persons and give preference to such persons in hiring. The highest priority shall be accorded to low-income persons who are parents of Follow Through children. The grantee shall establish hiring procedures which assure that the Policy Advisory Committee will be primarily responsible for recommending the filling of nonprofessional and paraprofessional positions.*

Based on the survey, 100 percent of schools served by Follow Through employed paid paraprofessionals (an average of 10.1 each). Eighty-two percent of Follow Through schools employed an average of 4.2 parents of children enrolled at the school in some of these positions, and 74 percent employed parents of Follow Through-served children (an average of 3.5 per school). Ninety-eight percent of the schools employing parents provided an average of 60 hours per year of formal training for the paid parent paraprofessionals who work directly with children in the instructional process.

For each school in the survey, the respondent was requested to check off activities of paid parent paraprofessionals and mark the two engaged in most frequently. Two activities clearly stood out: 72 percent of schools with Follow Through paid parent paraprofessionals reported that one of the two most frequently engaged in activities was working with individuals or small groups, reviewing or reteaching skills and concepts students have already learned. Thirty-four percent reported that giving special assistance to children with particular academic difficulties or weaknesses was one of the two activities engaged in most frequently. Only 18 percent reported that either assistance with non-instructional tasks (e.g., roll-taking, correcting papers,

---

*Rules and Regulations for the Follow Through Program, Section 158.20, Federal Register, Vol. 42, No. 125, June 29, 1977, page 33150.

playground, field trips), or the acquisition, preparation or retrieval of instructional materials was among the two most frequent activities.

The opportunity to nominate candidates for paid parent paraprofessional positions or to make the final selection could represent areas of strong parental influence on the educational process. The management activities of PACs (Table 5) suggest that considerable parental involvement of this type would be found and this is, indeed, the case. A series of questions about the individuals or groups with greatest responsibility in these two areas revealed that the PAC or a special hiring committee with parent members made or contributed to making nominations for these positions in 50 percent of the schools. (They were the only parties responsible for nominations in 23 percent of the schools.) The PAC or a special hiring committee with parent members made or contributed to the final selection at 30 percent of the schools. (They were solely responsible for selection in 14 percent of the Schools.) District and school staff (principal, teachers, personnel officer) alone made nominations in 26 percent of the schools and made final selections in 44 percent. In about 25 percent of the schools, it was not clear to the FPS respondent how these nominations and selections were made. Parents have a stronger role in nomination than in selection, which probably reflects centralization of hiring authority in the district offices.

Sixty-seven percent of Follow Through-served schools had a volunteer component in the project. All of these schools had parents of children currently enrolled at the school serving as volunteers. An average of 43 parents of children currently enrolled at the school served as volunteers. They were provided an average of 31 hours per year of formal training.

Parent volunteers performed some of the same tasks as paid parent paraprofessionals. Fifty-six percent of schools with parent volunteers indicated that working with individual children or small groups, reviewing or reteaching skills and concepts students have already learned was among the two most frequent activities of parent volunteers. Only 19 percent indicated that giving special assistance to children with particular academic difficulties or

weaknesses was one of the two most frequent activities of parent volunteers. Fifteen percent cited work in acquisition, preparation or retrieval of instructional materials while 20 percent cited relieving teachers of non-instructional tasks as among the two most frequent activities of parent volunteers. Thirty-eight percent of the schools reported that assisting in non-classroom components of the program (e.g., library, playground, field trips) was among the two most frequent activities of volunteers.

Parent volunteers are less likely to be used in instructional roles than are paid parent paraprofessionals, but substantial numbers of parent volunteers do engage in activities that supplement the instructional program.

The survey indicates that 97 percent of Follow Through-served schools tried to involve parents in the educational process as teachers for their own children at home through a diversity of activities or services provided to parents. Of the 97 percent of schools with any of these activities, 78 percent provided group training sessions, 73 percent provided workshops in which parents made educational games and/or other instructional materials, 66 percent provided individual training sessions, 90 percent sent home specially prepared materials for parents to use with their children, and 70 percent sent home written handouts (e.g., pamphlets, handbooks) intended for individual home study. The data collected in this area did not include information about the frequency or intensity of these activities, or about the costs.

FINANCING PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN FOLLOW THROUGH PROJECTS

The expenditures associated with parental involvement activities may be accounted for in a variety of ways. Indeed, what is considered to be a part of parental involvement also varied considerably from place to place.

The Federal Programs Survey asked whether or not each district used a "line item" form of accounting for parental involvement. Ninety-nine percent of the districts used a line item for parental involvement. Among these districts, however, there was little agreement as to what activities were included in the

line item. For example, only 66 percent of the line items included advisory group meeting expenses while all districts have these groups. Only 17 percent of districts included the costs of home-school activities such as using parents as teachers for their own children at home even though 99 percent of schools have these activities.

There is no uniformity in the manner by which LEAs keep track of parental involvement expenses. One district may cost parent paid aides under "parental involvement" while another district will locate these costs under "instruction." Accordingly, we are not able to assign any dollar amounts to the costs of parental involvement activities.

CHAPTER VIII. A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN FOUR FEDERAL PROGRAMS

This chapter presents a comparative view of the data presented in the preceding four chapters. The purpose of this chapter is to identify some of the factors that influence parental involvement, paying special attention to the differences in legislation and regulation across the four programs under study. The data on which these comparisons are based were collected in the spring of 1979.

All four programs are subject to cycles of legislative reauthorization and rewriting of regulations. At the time of the survey the Follow Through program was the only one of the four to have approved regulations. These regulations elaborate considerably on the legislation with respect to parental involvement.

Amending legislation for the other programs was enacted in October of 1978, (before the Federal Programs Survey), but regulations had not been approved by the time this report was written. Generally speaking, the proposed regulations for these three programs do not elaborate on the legislation with respect to parental involvement.

Changes in the legislation, the regulations, or the funding levels of the programs that would influence the results reported in this volume may occur subsequent to the publication of this report. While the conclusions and recommendations are expected to hold true in the future, the specific program data may be subject to modification.

The structure of the chapter parallels the program-by-program presentations. The discussion will proceed in the order: district characteristics, financial arrangements, parental involvement in governance, coordination of parental involvement activities, and parental involvement in educational programs.

DISTRICT CHARACTERISTICS

Data on the distribution of schools by type of locale are given in Table 19. Title I is far and away the largest of the programs in terms of total grants and number of participating districts. Because of its nearly complete coverage of all districts in the country, it reflects the fact that most of the districts are small and located in small towns and rural areas. By contrast, ESAA and Title VII grants are predominantly awarded to large-city districts. Follow Through seems more evenly split between the large-city and rural areas than the other programs.

Table 19. Distribution of Schools by Program and Locale
(Entries are the percentages of served schools in each type of locale.)

	Title I	ESAA	Title VII	Follow Through
Large Cities (over 200,000 in population) and their suburbs	17	47	52	32
Middle-size Cities (50,000-200,000) and their suburbs	13	17	13	19
Small Cities or Towns	31	20	17	17
Rural Areas	39	16	19	33

FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

Table 20 presents data on the average project size and funding levels. The ESAA programs gave the largest awards, on average, but served the greatest number of schools per participating district as well. Follow Through had the second largest average grant size and served the smallest number of schools per district, on average. Consequently, Follow Through had a great deal more money to spend per school than the other programs.*

Table 20. Average Indicators of Project Size and Funding Levels, by Program

	Title I	ESAA	Title VII	Follow Through
Average Number of Participating Schools	3.7	7.8	4.3	3.4
Average Grant Size	$175,000	$461,000	$216,000	$352,000
Average Funding Per Served School	$40,000	$37,000	$34,600	$95,500
Average Percentage of School Enrollment Served	24	49	21	74**
Average Funding Per Served Pupil	$500	$250	$360	$550

**Only enrollment in K-3 was considered for Follow Through.

*In the 1980-1981 school year, the appropriation for Follow Through was cut by 31 percent.

The level of funding per served pupil also reveals differences from program to program. Title I and Follow Through provide nearly equal amounts per served pupil, while the Title VII program provides about 65 percent of that amount and the ESAA program provides 50 percent. The effects of these differences in funding levels on parental involvement will be discussed later in this chapter.

In addition to the funding provided by the separate programs, it is of interest to note that 98 percent of Follow Through schools also received Title I funds. In the Title VII program, the figure was 73 percent, while in ESAA the figure was 68 percent. By contrast, considering the three programs mentioned above and PL94-142 as well, fully 29 percent of Title I schools received only Title I funding among these five sources.

An attempt was made to gather information on the financial support that districts provided for parental involvement activities. Unfortunately, even within a program, there is no standard accounting practice across districts that permits reliable reporting of this information. For example, only 55 percent of all Title I projects reported using a line item form of accounting for parental involvement. Only 68 percent of these line items included advisory group meeting expenses. Since virtually all Title I districts have advisory groups, there seems to be little uniformity in reporting their expenses.

The problem becomes even more severe if one attempts to compare across programs. The Follow Through directive to give preference to parents in hiring for paraprofessional positions would lead to reporting some of the cost of paraprofessionals as parental involvement costs. A Title I district with a similar level of parental participation might be much less likely to report any of these costs as part of their parental involvement expenses, feeling that they are exclusively instructional costs.

The inconsistencies in reporting make it essentially impossible to report valid data on the absolute or relative costs to districts and programs of parental involvement activities.

PARENTAL PARTICIPATION IN PROJECT GOVERNANCE

The data presented in the program chapters support the inference that the legislation and regulations defining the four programs strongly determine the nature of parental involvement in governance. In this chapter, data are extracted from the previous chapters to illustrate this point. In order to understand more fully the nature of parental involvement in this function, the reader should read through the program-specific chapters.

Membership characteristics of the district-level committees are influenced by the legislative and regulatory language as can be seen by the first two rows of Table 21. The Title I legislation specifically mentions only parents as members of this committee, without excluding others. The Title VII legislation mentions school staff, students, and community representatives as possible members, but maintains that parents should not be less than half the membership. The Follow Through regulations indicate that more than one-half of the membership must be low-income Follow Through parents and that they are to select other members from among community representatives (who have shown concern for the interests of low-income persons). ESAA legislation specifies that after the grant is awarded, the project funded by the grant must be operated in consultation with parents of the served children and representatives of the served communities, including the committee that reviewed the application, which was to be composed of parents, teachers, and secondary school students, if served. These are, perhaps, subtle distinctions, but they produce noticeable differences in advisory committee composition. The major question raised by these data is why the Follow Through projects have less involvement of community representatives than ESAA. The answer may lie in the fact that representation of low-income parents on the committee is emphasized in the criteria for evaluating project applications. In addition, the low-income parents may be regarded as appropriate representatives of the community interests and may not have been recorded as playing a dual role in answering the questions on the survey.

Table 21. Characteristics of District-Level Advisory Committees, by Program

	Title I	ESAA	Title VII	Follow Through
Percentages of District-Level Advisory Committees That Allow Community Representatives to Vote	4	88	16	37
Percentages of District-Level Advisory Committees in Which All Parents of Served Children are Elected	30	20	42	86
Percentages of District-Level Advisory Committees Whose Meetings are Chaired by a Committee Member	57	79	58	85
Percentages of District-Level Advisory Committees in Which a District Representative Sets the Agenda	34	27	9	17
Percentages of District-Level Advisory Committees Having a Budget	42	30	49	98
Average Budgets for District-Level Advisory Committees*	$1,250	$880	$2,066	$2,655

*These budget figures are not directly comparable and should be interpreted with caution. The text describing this table explains the variations in the activities covered by the budget figures.

A second indicator of the influence of legislation and regulation has to do with the manner in which parents of served children come to serve on the advisory committee. Follow Through regulations specify that low-income Follow Through parents are to be elected by their peers. Title VII legislation

states that committee members are to be selected by parents of children participating in the project. ESAA legislation does not address this issue. Title I legislation presents an apparent anomaly: it clearly specifies that the committee members should be elected. However, this legislation was enacted after many of the committees had already been established for the 1978-1979 school year. Presumably, Title I-served districts have moved into compliance with this legislation since the survey was conducted (in the spring of 1979).

The last four rows of Table 21 and all of Table 22 will be discussed together. Taken as a whole, they provide further evidence that legislation and regulation influence parental involvement in project governance.

The Follow Through regulations state that the project-level advisory committees are to "assist with the planning and operation of project activities and to actively participate in decision making concerning these activities." They go on to enumerate nine specific duties for the PACs to carry out, including: helping to develop all components of the project proposal, approving the project proposal in its final form, helping to develop criteria for selecting professional staff and recommending the selection of such staff, and exercising the primary responsibility in recommending the selection of paraprofessional staff.* The regulations provide an incentive for achieving the general goal by noting that evidence that the specific duties are implemented will count toward the continued funding of projects.

ESAA legislation indicates that projects should "be operated in consultation with, and with the involvement of" the advisory committee. The Title VII legislation states that projects should "provide for the continuing consultation with, and participation by" the advisory committee. The Title I legislation

*These are paraphrases of the actual statements which may be found in the chapter on the Follow Through program.

Table 22. Participation of District-Level Advisory Groups in Selected Management Activities, by Program (Entries in the table are the estimated percentages of district-level advisory groups that have at least an advisory role in the listed management activity.)

Management Activity	Title I	ESAA	Title VII	Follow Through
Develop Project Application	97	98	100	100
Plan Project Components	68	96	86	100
Evaluate Meeting of Goals	79	91	89	99
Sign Off Parental Involvement Part of Budget	5[illegible]	79	74	100
Sign Off Total Project Budget	55	65	60	94
Select Project Professionals	28	43	38	86
Select Project Paraprofessionals	21	47	32	97

states that advisory councils should have "responsibility for advising (the district) in planning for, and implementation and evaluation of, its (Title I) projects."

None of these last three programs specify duties for the PAC. Furthermore, they evaluate proposals based upon assurances that these advisory groups will come into existence and function in the desired manner. Refunding decisions are not stated to be based on evidence of successful implementation.

The data in Table 22 show the percentages of the district-level (project-level in the case of Follow Through) advisory groups that have at least an advisory role in the various management activities listed in the table. This level of participation was chosen for presentation in this chapter because it is the common denominator for all of the programs. The committees and councils making up the complimentary percentages were reported to have no involvement whatever in each of the management activities in the table.

The data indicate that the specific nature of the Follow Through regulations leads to their PACs more often having at least an advisory role. The clearest example of this is in the area of selection of professional and paraprofessional personnel. The large difference between Follow Through and the other programs must surely be due to the specific mandate in the Follow Through regulations. The next largest difference is in the area of budget where the Follow Through mandate that PACs approve the proposal leads to the differences evident in the table. Finally, the areas having to do with planning and evaluation show smaller differences because the differences in mandate are less sharply defined.

One measure of the support available for advisory committee activities is the budget that is allocated for their use. Follow Through is the only program of the four that mentions a budget for the advisory committee. The regulations state that it must be "sufficient to allow (the PAC) to effectively fulfill its responsibilities." Again, this specific language results in a considerable difference in the proportion of advisory committees with budgets (Table 21).

The magnitude of the budgets is probably related to the available funding per pupil. The budgets for Title VII committees seem large given their funding level and their apparent activity level. Budget size may reflect activities of advisory committees that were not included in our study (such as training of the members or budgets for special events sponsored by the committees) in addition to the activities associated with governance. Thus, these budgets cannot be used to estimate the costs of parent participation in governance.

The last item to be discussed with respect to parental involvement in governance has to do with the conduct of the meetings of the district-level advisory committees (Table 21). None of the four programs addresses issues of how these meetings should be conducted in their legislation or regulations. However, the differences across programs that are revealed in the middle two items in Table 21 are probably related to the emphasis on parental involvement in the legislation and regulations. The fact that Follow Through regulations indicate a desire to have evidence of parental participation as a condition of refunding provides an incentive that may account for some of this difference in tone and the resultant outcomes. Generally speaking, Follow Through PAC meetings are run by a PAC member using an agenda that was set by PAC members (often in collaboration with district personnel). By contrast, Title I PAC meetings are conducted by a PAC member only slightly more than half the time and the agenda is often set by a district representative. This is consistent with the Title I mandate to involve the PAC in advisement about project matters as contrasted to the Follow Through mandate to actively participate in decision making about project activities it has assisted in planning. Title VII and ESAA advisory groups fall between these two extremes, as would be expected from the language of their enabling legislation.

COORDINATION OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Coordination of parental involvement activities is not addressed in the legislation or regulation for any of the four programs. It is reasonable to assume that the amount of coordination provided and the activities that coordinators engage in are related both to the amount of parental involvement mandated by the program and the financial resources available to provide the services.

Table 23 shows the differences across programs on the provision of coordination services. The following presentation discusses the programmatic features liable to result in a need for these services.

Several sections of the Follow Through regulations deal with aspects of parental involvement other than as PAC members, including: participation in the

Table 23. District-Level and School-Level Provisions for Coordination of Parental Involvement Activities, by Program

	Title I	ESAA	Title VII	Follow Through
Average District-Level Hours of Parent Coordination Per Week	5.4	35	21	80
Two Most Frequent Activities of District-Level Coordinators	G,M	M,R	G,R	G,R
Average School-Level Hours of Parent Coordination Per Week	3.2	7.4	7.0	36.8
Two Most Frequent Activities of School-Level Coordinators	R,M	M,V	M,V	R,V

G: Informing parents about program guidelines and regulations.
M: Attending meetings to inform parents about the district and school activities and policies.
V: Coordinating visitations to parents to inform them about district and school activities and policies.
R: Recruiting parents to participate in various activities.

classroom as observers, volunteers or paid employees, and participation in educational and community activities developed through other program components. Follow Through projects are also to have a social services component directed at the families of low-income Follow Through children. A career development program is to be provided for paraprofessionals and nonprofessionals (Follow Through parents are to have priority in access to both types of positions). The extent of these activities would seem to necessitate a high level of coordination, both to carry out the activities and to recruit parental participation.

The Title VII program legislation, like that for the Title I program, specifies roles for parents primarily as advisors through the CACs. However, Title VII projects can involve a considerable amount of bicultural activity in which parents participate as exemplars of the culture. Coordinating these activities (e.g., classroom demonstrations, assemblies at which children perform skits, etc.) may account for some of the coordination time spent in these projects.

The focus of ESAA, overcoming the problems of racial group isolation and the difficulties of implementing integration, suggests, again, a stress on multicultural relations that would result in a need for a good deal of parental coordination. The ESAA program legislation also requires that parents be shown preference in hiring for paraprofessional positions. Recruitment of parents for these positions would also require coordination. Finally, the larger average number of served schools per district might require parent coordination in order to establish and run the required advisory committee.

The data in Table 23 seems to be largely consistent with the needs presented above. Surely, the much larger amount of coordination hours in the Follow Through projects reflects not only the needs established above, but the availablity of funds to support this activity. The emphasis of Follow Through coordinators on recruitment reflects the strong regulatory mandate to involve parents in most aspects of the program. The emphasis on recruitment and home visitation in ESAA and Title VII probably reflects the multicultural concerns of those programs, and the fact that they have sufficient support to perform those services.

Title I projects, on the other hand, have only provided enough of these services to permit their coordinators to engage in making general presentations about the program's regulations and guidelines and about district and school activities and policies. Some recruitment does go on at the Title I schools, however. This is consistent with the Title I legislation which addresses parental involvement only in terms of participation on the advisory groups, and mandates such groups at the school level.

PARENT PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

In this functional area, as in governance, there are differences in the specificity of the legislation and regulations defining the four programs that lead to differences in the degree of parental involvement. Table 24 shows the differences across programs in this area of participation.

Table 24. Parent Participation in the Educational Function, by Program

	Title I	ESAA	Title VII	Follow Through
Percentages of Schools Employing Parents of Served Children as Paid Paraprofessionals	9	14	18	74
Percentages of Schools With Parents Serving as Volunteers	14	17	28	67
Percentages of Schools Providing Activities and Services to Parents Who Teach Their Own Children at Home as Part of the Project:				
Group Training	27	35	50	76
Workshops	39	26	50	71
Individual Training	26	23	28	64

PARAPROFESSIONALS

Follow Through regulations state that "whenever an opening exists in project staff positions for nonprofessionals or paraprofessionals... the highest priority will be accorded to low-income persons who are parents of Follow Through children." The regulations also require projects to actively recruit parents for these positions. The ESAA legislation states that preference shall be

given to parents of children affected by the project in recruiting and hiring teacher aides. The level of emphasis on parental involvement in the ESAA legislation is less than in the Follow Through regulations. Fewer ESAA schools employ paraprofessionals (66 percent vs. 100 percent) and they employ fewer people in these positions, on average (2.5 vs. 10.1). The survey did not inquire about the recruitment processes, so it is not known whether or not the numbers of parents of served children employed in these positions by the projects represent preferential treatment for the parents.

Neither the legislation for Title I, nor that for Title VII addresses these issues. The higher frequency of parental participation as paid paraprofessionals in Title VII, as contrasted to Title I, may reflect the fact that parents of served children are a likely source of bilingual adults needed in the Title VII-served classrooms.

VOLUNTEERS

The four programs are ordered in the same way with respect to frequency of parent participation in volunteer components as they were with respect to paraprofessional components. The specific language in the Follow Through regulations (cited above) is one source of the large difference between this program and the other three. Another source, which was not investigated directly in this study, is the provision in the regulations allowing certain in-kind contributions (such as volunteer time) to be counted in place of cash in payment of the non-federal share of the cost of the project (up to 20 percent of the cost must be borne by the district). This incentive would surely contribute to the greater degree of volunteer activity in Follow Through projects.

PARENTS AS TEACHERS OF THEIR OWN CHILDREN AT HOME

This potential area of parental involvement is not addressed specifically in any of the legislation or regulations for the four programs. The frequency with which schools reported these activities is apparently linked to the

program's emphasis on parental participation, and on the availability of funds to support the activities. This is certainly the explanation for the greater emphasis on these activities, especially individual training, that occurs in Follow Through. The degree of emphasis in Title VII projects can be explained by the need to inform non-English speaking parents how they can help in the educational process.

OVERALL SUMMARY

The overall results of the study may be summarized in one succinct statement:

- Legislation and regulation can provide a powerful motivation to foster and support parental involvement.

The data support the inference that differences between programs in the nature and extent of parental involvement are related to differences in the content of the legislation and regulations defining the programs. The data reveal that the specific content of the legislation and regulations influences the specific activities undertaken in the name of parental involvement at project sites in three ways:

- By emphasizing parental involvement in the choice of language used to express the legislative or regulatory intent. This effect is seen in the generally higher levels of parent involvement in the Follow Through projects, even in areas where the nature of parental involvement is not specified in the regulations.

- By specifying the activities in which parents are to engage. This effect is seen in the much higher levels of parental involvement in the Follow Through program in areas where the nature of parental involvement is specified in the regulations.

- By providing incentives for obtaining participation of parents. Follow Through is the only program to provide these incentives. The

effect of tying refunding to evidence that parental involvement has taken place seems pervasive and is difficult to disentangle from other effects. The effect of allowing in-kind contributions to offset the non-federal share of project costs probably has its greatest effect on the volunteer component.

There are two secondary conclusions:

- The level of funding influences the extent of parental involvement activities.

- It is important to monitor the extent to which districts implement mandated activities.

Comparisons across programs reveal that the level of funding (on a per-pupil basis) influenced the availability of funds to provide certain services and activities related to parental involvement. However, the data were not sufficiently clear or specific to permit an accurate estimation of the costs of these services and activities.

Specifying in legislation and regulations that certain activities should take place within local projects probably does not guarantee that they will take place. While the survey did not inquire about monitoring practices, certain features of the data indicate that some monitoring of the implementation of required activities is desirable. In particular, the language in the Follow Through regulations requiring evidence of parental involvement as a condition of refunding both provides an incentive and indicates a requirement for self-monitoring.

CONCLUSIONS

It bears repeating that the four programs under study have different purposes and goals. The legislation and regulations for each program attempt to assure a role for parents in the context of that program's intent. Presumably, each

program office believes that the roles it allocates to parents advance the goals of the program. The historical origins of the Follow Through program have led it to emphasize parental involvement as one means to mobilize and coordinate community resources for the benefit of children. The other programs, not sharing these historical antecedents, may have felt uncomfortable with specifying additional parental involvement components (and requiring assurances of compliance) unless there was compelling evidence that these components would advance the main purposes of the program.

Within the context of each program, the value of emphasizing parental involvement has to be weighed against the values assigned to other components demanding programmatic support, especially the provision of instructional services. The data from this study indicate that the level of parental involvement could be increased if:

- The legislation and regulations defining the program emphasized parental involvement, specified the desired forms of involvement, and provided incentives for involvement.

- Funding was provide for the specified activities, especially for mandated advisory committees and for parent coordinators.

- Some form of monitoring the implementation of specific activities was provided.

The data from this study also indicate that project managers at the local level generally do attempt to implement the mandated parental involvement components, going beyond the mandate to add other activities that seem suitable in the local context. These additional activities are chosen to promote the goals of the local project. It is worth observing that there are projects in all four programs that reported broad and intense involvement of parents in the management and operation of the project activities. This suggests that there may be ways in which parental involvement can be an effective force in achieving the goals of each of the programs.

The subsequent phases of the Study of Parental Involvement will probe more deeply for the factors contributing to and the outcomes resulting from parental involvement in these four programs. Describing the relationship among the functions of parental involvement and their joint relationship to programmatic goals is the objective of the next phase of the study.

REFERENCES

CPI Associates. An exploratory study of the impact of parent advisory councils on the management and administration of Title I programs at the local level. Dallas, TX: Author, 1979.

Center for Equal Education. Effects of parents on schooling. Research Review of Equal Education, 1977, 1, 30-40.

Chong, M. The role of parents as decision makers in compensatory education: A review of the literature. Washington, DC: National Institute for Education, 1976.

Coulson, J., Ozenne, D., Bradford, C., Doherty, W., Duck, G., Hemenway, J., & Van Gelder, N. The second year of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) implementation, TM-5236/009/00. Santa Monica, CA: System Development Corporation, 1976.

Danoff, M., Coles, G., McLaughlin, D., & Reynolds, D. Evaluation of the impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/English Bilingual Education Program (Vol. III). Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research, 1978.

Gonzalez, M., Ogue, J., Shapiro, G., & Tepping, B. Standards for discussion and presentation of errors in survey and census data. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 1975, 70, Part II.

Gordon, I. What does research say about the effects of parent involvement on schooling? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1978.

Gordon, I., Olmsted, P., Rubin, R., & True, J. Aspects of parental involvement in the Parent Education Follow Through Program. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 1979.

Haney, W., & Pennington, N. Reanalysis of Follow Through parent and teacher data from spring 1975. (Report to U.S. Office of Education.) Cambridge, MA: The Huron Institute, October, 1978.

Hoepfner, R., Wellisch, J., & Zagorski, H. The sample for the Sustaining Effects Study and projections of its characteristics to the national population (SES Report I). Santa Monica, CA: System Development Corporation, 1977.

Levin, H. A decade of policy developments in improving education and training for low-income populations. In R. Haveman (Ed.) A decade of federal antipoverty programs. New York, NY: Academic Press, 1977.

National Institute for Education. Compensatory Education Study. Washington, DC: National Institute for Education, 1978.

Nero & Associates. Follow Through: A story of educational change. Portland, OR: Nero & Associates, 1976.

Olmstead, P. P., & Rubin, R. I. Parent involvement: Perspectives from the Follow Through experience. Paper presented at the Parent Education and Public Policy Conference, Rougemont, NC, March 1980.

Peterson, P., & Greenstone, J. Racial change and citizen participation: The mobilization of low-income communities through community action. In R. Haveman (Ed.) A decade of federal antipoverty programs. New York, NY: Academic Press, 1977.

Rehab Group, Inc. A study of supplementary training available to Follow Through parents and aides. (Report to U.S. Office of Education.) Falls Church, VA, June 1980.

Stearns, M., & Peterson, S. Parental roles and underlying models in compensatory education programs. In Parent involvement in compensatory education programs. Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Research Institute, 1973.

Wang, M., Hoepfner, R., Zagorski, H., Hemenway, J., Brown C., & Bear, M. The nature and recipients of compensatory education (SES Report 5). Santa Monica, CA: System Development Corporation, 1978.

Wellisch, J., Marcus, A., MacQueen A., & Duck G. An in-depth study of Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Schools: 1974-75 (TM-5236/010/00. Santa Monica, CA: System Development Corporation, 1976.

APPENDIX A

ESEA TITLE I PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE - DISTRICT LEVEL
ESEA TITLE I PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE - SCHOOL LEVEL
ESAA PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE - DISTRICT LEVEL
ESAA PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE - SCHOOL LEVEL
ESEA TITLE VII BILINGUAL PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE - DISTRICT LEVEL
ESEA TITLE VII BILINGUAL PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE - SCHOOL LEVEL
FOLLOW THROUGH PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE - PROJECT LEVEL
FOLLOW THROUGH PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE - SCHOOL LEVEL

FEDAC Clearance No. S-9
Expiration date: 4/80

ESEA TITLE I PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

DISTRICT-LEVEL

As a vital part of the Study of Parental Involvement in Four Federal Education Programs, this questionnaire is designed to collect information related to ESEA Title I-supported parental involvement activities in your district. Although parental participation is considered a valued aspect of several federal educational programs including Title I, little is actually known about the nature and extent of such participation. The present study is being conducted by System Development Corporation (SDC) in direct response to a congressional request for systematic, descriptive information on parental involvement in major federal educational programs, and to similar requests by federal program offices. In addition, the results of the Study will be extremely helpful to local school people and parents who are attempting to promote parental involvement in their districts and schools. All responses to this questionnaire will be treated in accordance with federal privacy acts; results will not be reported in a form identifiable with any person, school, or district.

This questionnaire requests descriptive information about your district as well as information about two parental involvement program components. More specifically, it is organized into the following three sections:

SECTION A. District Descriptive Information

SECTION B. Supervision/Coordination of Parental Involvement Activities

SECTION C. District-level Title I Parent Advisory Councils

To answer some of the questions contained in these sections, you may need to consult with other personnel in the district office. We would appreciate your gathering the information needed to complete this questionnaire at your earliest convenience. A member of the study staff will be contacting you by telephone in the next few weeks to record your answers.

This study is sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education's Office of Evaluation and Dissemination. While you are not required to participate, your cooperation is needed to make the results of the study comprehensive, accurate, and timely.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

SECTION A.
DISTRICT DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

Please answer the following questions about your district. If you are completing questionnaires for more than one federally funded program within your district, the first three items should be completed only once. If you have already answered these questions, go on to *Question 4* in Section A, District Descriptive Information.

1. What is your district's estimated 1978-79 *per pupil expenditure* for the elementary grades?

   $ _____

2. Indicate the total amount of each type of federal funding listed below that your district is receiving during the 1978-79 school year. (If no money is being received from a particular source, enter zero.)

   $ _____ Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I

   $ _____ Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA)

   $ _____ Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title VII Bilingual

   $ _____ Follow Through

3. Withing your district, which, if any, of the following federal programs provide services to *non-public school students*? (Mark all that apply.)

   _____ Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I

   _____ Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title VII Bilingual

   _____ Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA)

   _____ Follow Through

4. Does your district's Title I budget include a *line item* for parental involvement?

   _____ Yes

   _____ No (Go on to Section B, Supervision/Coordination of Parental Involvement Activities.)

   a. If yes, please indicate the amount of the parental involvement line item for the 1978-79 school year.

   $ _____

b. If yes, what types of services and/or activities are supported within the parental involvement budget category (e.g., district Title I PACs, school Title I PACs, parental involvement specialist, school-parent liaison, paid parent paraprofessionals, parent volunteer program, home tutoring program)?

_____

_____

_____

_____

SECTION B.

SUPERVISION/COORDINATION OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Questions in this section are concerned with the person or group of persons who might operate *at the district level* to supervise and/or coordinate parental involvement activities. This person(s) might have responsibilities such as: informing parents about district or school activities or policies, coordinating training or education programs for parents, or serving as a mediator or arbitrator between parents and the district and/or school. If there is a person or group of persons whose responsibilities include supervising and/or coordinating parental involvement activities at the school level *but who operates at more than one school*, please consider the person(s) to be a district-level staff person(s) and answer the questions in this section about that person(s). If there is no person in your district who is responsible for supervising and/or coordinating parental involvement activities, check the box below and go on to Section C, District-level Title I Parent Advisory Councils.

☐ No person responsible for supervising and/or coordinating parental involvement activities

1. How many persons are there at the district level who serve as *full-time* parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 5.)

_____ Number of full-time parental involvement specialists/parent coordinators

2. How many of these full-time, district-level parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators spend time on activities related to parental involvement *within the Title I program*? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 5.)

_____ Number of full-time parental involvement specialists/parent coordinators who spend time on Title I parental involvement activities

3. Please estimate the *total* number of hours per week spent by these full-time parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators on activities related to parental involvement within the Title I program.

_____ Hours per week spent on Title I parental involvement activities

4. Do the district-level parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators associated with the Title I program also serve any other federal program?

_____ No (Go on to Question 5.)

_____ Yes

a. If yes, indicate which of the following programs, in addition to Title I, are served by these district-level parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators.

_____ ESEA Title VII Bilingual

_____ ESAA

_____ Follow Through

_____ Other (Please specify.) _____

You have just been answering questions about full-time parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators who spend at least some of their time on Title I parental involvement activities. Questions 5 and 6 ask about persons who are *not full-time* parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators but whose *responsibilities nonetheless include* supervising and/or coordinating Title I parental involvement activities.

5. How many persons are there at the district level who are *not full-time* parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators but whose responsibilities include supervising and/or coordinating parental involvement activities associated with the Title I program? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 7.)

_____ Number of persons who are not full-time parental involvement specialists/coordinators but whose responsibilities include supervising and/or coordinating Title I parental involvement activities

6. Please estimate the *total* number of hours per week spent by the persons identified in Question 5 on activities related to parental involvement within the Title I program.

_____ Hours per week spent on Title I parental involvement activities

7. Listed below are some activities in which persons (whether working full-time or part-time) who are responsible for supervising and/or coordinating parental involvement activities might engage. Please go through the list and mark with a check each of those activities in which the district-level person(s) responsible for coordinating and/or supervising parental involvement activities within the Title I program actually engages. Then go back and indicate with the numbers *1* and *2* the two activities engaged in most frequently by this person(s).

(a) _____ Coordinate visitations to parents to inform them about district or school activities or policies

(b) _____ Participate in meetings to inform parents about district or school activities or policies

(c) _____ Coordinate activities for parents to train them and/or inform them about regulations and guidelines for the Title I program (e.g., workshops, conferences, seminars)

(d) _____ Help to organize and/or to run parent education programs

(e) _____ Coordinate a program to provide counsel for parents concerning family relationships

(f) _____ Recruit parents for involvement in Title I district or school activities (e.g., district or school parent advisory councils, paid paraprofessional positions, volunteer positions, home tutors)

(g) _____ Serve as an advocate for parents before district and school administration

(h) _____ Serve as an advocate for the district and/or school to the parents

(i) _____ Serve as an arbitrator between parents and the district and/or school

(j) _____ Provide informal opportunities for parents and district and/or school personnel to interact

(k) _____ Other (Please specify.) _____

SECTION C.

DISTRICT-LEVEL TITLE I PARENT ADVISORY COUNCILS

Questions in this section are concerned with district-level Parent Advisory Councils which are associated with the management of Title I projects. If there is no such district-level council for Title I in your district, check the box below.

☐ No District-level Parent Advisory Council

(This completes the formal portion of the questionnaire. Please turn to page 13.)

1. How many *voting* members are serving on your district's Title I Parent Advisory Council (PAC) during the 1978-79 school year?

_____ Number of voting members

2. Indicate the number of *voting parent* members presently serving on the district Title I Parent Advisory Council (PAC) who belong to the following racial/ethnic groups.

_____ American Indian or Alaskan Native
_____ Asian or Pacific Islander
_____ Black, not of Hispanic origin
_____ Hispanic
_____ White, not of Hispanic origin

_____ Total number of voting parent members

3. How many of the voting members presently serving on the district Title I PAC are parents of children who are currently *receiving Title I services* in the district?

_____ Number of voting members who are parents of children being served

4. For each category of district Title I PAC members listed below, please indicate 1) whether the members from this category are customarily *elected, appointed,* or *self-selected* (i.e., volunteers), and 2) whether the members customarily hold *voting* or *non-voting* memberships on the district PAC. (If a category of individuals is not represented on your district PAC, leave the spaces corresponding to that category blank.)

Categories (Roles) of Individuals	Elected (1)	Appointed (2)	Volunteer (3)	Voting (4)	Non-voting (5)
(a) Parents of students served by the Title I program					
(b) Parents of other students attending school in this district					
(c) Students					
(d) Professional school personnel					
(e) Paid Aides and Assistants					
(f) Representatives of non-public schools					
(g) Representatives of community organizations (e.g., civic, business, church)					

5. Is the entire *voting* membership of the district PAC selected (e.g., elected, appointed, self-selected) at the same time?

(a) _____ Yes, all of the voting seats on the district PAC are filled at the same time and for the same terms of office.

(b) _____ No, terms of office are staggered so that all of the voting members are not selected at the same point in time.

(c) _____ There are no set terms of office for voting members of the district PAC.

6. Which of the following statements best describes the policy governing how long a member can serve on your district's PAC? (Mark one.)

(a) _____ A member can serve on the district PAC for only *one* term of office.

(b) _____ A member can serve more than one term of office; however, these terms of office must be non-consecutive.

(c) _____ A member can serve on the district PAC for a prescribed number of consecutive terms of office.

(d) _____ A member can serve on the district PAC for an unrestricted number of consecutive terms of office or an unlimited amount of time.

7. Which of the following statements best describes the procedure customarily used to select district Title I PAC officers. Please answer this question first for the PAC chairperson and then for all other PAC officers.

	Elected to the position(s) (1)	Appointed to the position(s) (2)	Volunteered for the position(s) (3)
PAC Chairperson			
Other PAC Officers			

8. Please mark the statement which best describes the terms of office for district Title I PAC officers.

(a) _____ A district PAC officer can serve as an officer for only *one* term of office.

(b) _____ A district PAC officer can serve more than one term of office; however, these terms of office must be nonconsecutive.

(c) _____ A district PAC officer can serve in his or her position for a prescribed number of consecutive terms of office.

(d) _____ A district PAC officer can serve as an officer for an unrestricted number of consecutive terms of office or an unlimited amount of time.

9. How many formal business meetings of the *entire* district PAC will be held during the 1978-79 school year? (Include in your total the meetings which have already been held *plus* an estimate of the number of meetings which will be held between now and the end of the school year. Do *not* include workshops, training sessions or seminars held for PAC members.)

_____ Total number of formal business meetings this school year

10. Below are listed several activities often associated with the conduct of formal meetings of a district PAC. Please indicate, by checking the appropriate column, the person or group of persons who has *primary responsibility* for carrying out each activity on your district's PAC. If responsibility for a given activity is *shared equally* by two or more persons or groups, please check the appropriate columns for all persons or groups who share that responsibility.

	Title I Project Director (1)	Title I Parent Coordinator/ Parental Involvement Specialist (2)	PAC Chair-person (3)	Other PAC officer(s) (4)	Other PAC member(s) (5)	Other (Please specify below.) (6)
(a) Preside at PAC meetings						
(b) Set PAC meeting agendas						
(c) Select PAC meeting sites						
(d) Select PAC meeting times						
(e) Review/approve PAC meeting minutes						

11. Below are listed some of the important management activities in which district PACs may be engaged. Please indicate by checking the appropriate column the *level of authority* which your district PAC exercises with regard to each activity. (Mark only one column for each activity.)

Management Activities	PAC has no advisory or decision-making role and no responsibility or no opportunity for involvement. (1)	PAC advises the LEA in making decisions; LEA has sole decision-making responsibility. (2)	Decision-making responsibility is jointly shared by PAC and LEA. (3)	PAC has exclusive or principal decision-making authority. (4)
(a) Developing the Title I project application				
(b) Conducting district-wide needs assessment for the Title I project				
(c) Planning specific components of the Title I project				
(d) Establishing goals and objectives for Title I project components				
(e) Monitoring implementation of Title I project components				
(f) Evaluating the extent to which goals and objectives for various project components are being met				
(g) Reviewing Title I district budget allocations for parental involvement activities				
(h) Reviewing other Title I district budget allocations				
(i) Signing off on Title I district budget allocations for parental involvement activities				
(j) Signing off on other Title I district budget allocations				
(k) Establishing eligibility requirements for employing parents with Title I funds				
(l) Selecting Title I professional staff (e.g., teachers, math/reading specialists, media resource specialists)				
(m) Selecting Title I paraprofessional staff (e.g., classroom aides, teaching assistants, playground/lunchroom aides, clerical assistants)				
(n) Evaluating Title I professional staff				
(o) Evaluating Title I paraprofessional staff				
(p) Handling staff and community complaints				
(q) Other (Please specify.) _____ _____ _____				

10

12. Are there *subcommittees* of your district's PAC which meet regularly for the purpose of handling certain aspects of PAC business? (Please consider an executive committee to be a subcommittee; do *not* consider an *ad hoc*, i.e., temporary, committee to be a subcommittee.)

_____ Yes

_____ No (Go on to Question 13.)

a. If yes, please indicate the number of subcommittees which have met regularly during the 1978-79 school year.

_____ subcommittees have met regularly during the 1978-79 school year

b. If yes, what types of responsibilities have been delegated to these subcommittees (e.g., authority to decide upon PAC budget allocations, responsibility for monitoring or evaluating Title I program components)?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. Indicate the total amount of your district PAC's *budget for operating expenses and activities* during the 1978-79 school year. (If none, enter zero)

$ _____

14. How much of the money referred to in Question 13 is funding over which the district PAC has *direct control*? In other words, how much of this money can the district PAC use at its own *discretion*? (If none, enter zero.)

$ _____

15. How many of the *voting* members presently serving on your *district's PAC* also serve as voting members on district-level advisory groups for the following federal programs? (If none, enter zero.)

_____ serve on an Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) district-level advisory group

_____ serve on an ESEA Title VII Bilingual district-level advisory group

_____ serve on a Follow Through district-level advisory group

16. How many of the *voting* members presently serving on your *district's* PAC also serve as voting members on school-level Title I PACs? (If none, enter zero.)

_____ serve on school-level Title I PACs

17. Although Title I advisory councils are mandated at only district and school levels, they are sometimes instituted at other levels. We are interested in determining the extent to which advisory councils associated with the Title I program exist beyond the district and school levels. Please indicate which, if any, of the following types of advisory councils serve the Title I projects operating in your district or in the schools within your district.

_____ Regional (i.e., advisory councils that consist of members from more than one district within a state)

_____ County

_____ Intermediate (i.e., advisory councils that consist of members from more than one school within a district)

_____ Other (Please specify.) _____

You have now completed the formal portion of this questionnaire. The System Development Corporation person who will be calling to record your responses to these questions will also be anxious to talk with you about any other significant parental involvement activities that occur at the district level as part of your Title I project. *Please use the space below to jot down any comments that you would like to share with us* about your district's Title I parental involvement activities.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

FEDAC Clearance No. S-9
Expiration date: 4/80

ESEA TITLE I PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE SCHOOL-LEVEL

As a vital part of the Study of Parental Involvement in Four Federal Education Programs, this questionnaire is designed to collect information related to ESEA Title I-supported parental involvement activities in your school. Although parental participation is considered a valued aspect of several federal educational programs including Title I, little is actually known about the nature and extent of such participation. The present study is being conducted by System Development Corporation (SDC) in direct response to a congressional request for systematic, descriptive information on parental participation in major federal educational programs, and to similar requests by federal program offices. In addition, the results of the Study will be extremely helpful to local school people and parents who are attempting to promote parental involvement in their districts and schools. All responses to this questionnaire will be treated in accordance with federal privacy acts; results will not be reported in a form identifiable with any person, school, or district.

This questionnaire requests descriptive information about the school identified above as well as information about several parental involvement program components. More specifically, it is organized into the following seven sections:

SECTION A.	School Descriptive Information
SECTION B.	School-level Title I Parent Advisory Councils
SECTION C.	Paid Paraprofessionals
SECTION D.	Volunteers
SECTION E.	Parents as Teachers for Their Own Children
SECTION F.	Coordination/Promotion of Parental Involvement Activities
SECTION G.	School Funding

To answer some of the questions contained in these sections, you may need to consult with personnel at the school. We would appreciate your gathering the information needed to complete this questionnaire at your earliest convenience. A member of the study staff will be contacting you by telephone in the next few weeks to record your answers.

This study is sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education's Office of Evaluation and Dissemination. While you are not required to participate, your cooperation is needed to make the results of the study comprehensive, accurate, and timely.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

SECTION A.
SCHOOL DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

Please answer the following questions about the school named on the front of this questionnaire. If you are completing questionnaires for more than one federally funded program within the school, Section A, School Descriptive Information, should be completed only once. If you have already answered these questions, go on to Section B, School-level Title I Parent Advisory Councils.

1. As of October 1, 1978, indicate the number of students in this school enrolled in each of the grades listed below. (If this school does not contain a particular grade level, enter zero.)

_____ Kindergarten	_____ Grade 4	_____ Grade 8
_____ Grade 1	_____ Grade 5	_____ Grades 9-12
_____ Grade 2	_____ Grade 6	_____ Other
_____ Grade 3	_____ Grade 7	_____ Total Enrollment

2. What percentage of the students in this school are considered to be low-income students?

   _____ % of students

   a. What criterion did you use to estimate the above percentage of low-income students in the school (e.g., students eligible for free or reduced price lunch, students from families eligible for Aid to Families with Dependent Children)?

   _____

3. Please indicate your estimate of the percentage of students enrolled in this school who live with parents or guardians whose home language is not English.

   _____ % of students

4. Which of the following best describes the location of this school? (Mark one.)

   (a) _____ Large city, over 200,000 population
   (b) _____ Suburb of a large city
   (c) _____ Middle-size city, 50,000 to 200,000 population
   (d) _____ Suburb of a middle-size city
   (e) _____ Small city or town, less than 50,000 population
   (f) _____ Rural area near a large or middle-size city
   (g) _____ Rural area, not near a large or middle-size city

SECTION B.
SCHOOL-LEVEL TITLE I PARENT ADVISORY COUNCILS

Questions in this section are concerned with Parent Advisory Councils (PACs) which are associated with the management of *school-level* Title I projects. We understand that for some small schools or schools with minimal Title I projects, a single Title I PAC may represent more than one school. If your school is represented by such a PAC, please consider that PAC to be a school-level council and answer the questions in this section about the entire PAC. If there is no school-level council for Title I representing this school, check the box below and go on to Section C, Paid Paraprofessionals.

☐ No School-level Parent Advisory Council

1. Does this school's Title I Parent Advisory Council (PAC) also represent any other Title I schools?

   ___ Yes
   ___ No (Go on to Question 2.)

   a. If yes, please indicate the *total* number of schools represented by this PAC.

      ___ Number of schools represented by this school's Title I PAC

2. How many *voting* members are serving on this school's Title I PAC during the 1978-79 school year?

   ___ Number of voting members

3. Indicate the number of *voting parent* members presently serving on this school's Title I PAC who belong to the following racial/ethnic groups.

   ___ American Indian or Alaskan Native
   ___ Asian or Pacific Islander
   ___ Black, not of Hispanic origin
   ___ Hispanic
   ___ White, not of Hispanic origin

   ___ Total number of voting parent members

4. How many of the voting members presently serving on this school's Title I PAC are parents of children who are currently *receiving Title I services* at this school?

   ___ Number of voting members who are parents of children being served

5. For each category of school Title I PAC members listed below, please indicate 1) whether the members from this category are customarily *elected, appointed, or self-selected* (i.e., volunteers), *and* 2) whether the members customarily hold *voting* or *non-voting* memberships on the school PAC. (If a category of individuals is not represented on the school PAC, leave the spaces corresponding to that category blank.)

Categories (Roles) of Individuals	Elected (1)	Appointed (2)	Volunteer (3)	Voting (4)	Non-Voting (5)
(a) Parents of students served by the Title I project					
(b) Parents of other students attending the school					
(c) Students					
(d) Professional school personnel					
(e) Paid Aides and Assistants					
(f) Representatives of non-public schools					
(g) Representatives of community organizations (e.g., civic, business, church)					

6. Is the entire *voting* membership of the school PAC selected (e.g., elected, appointed, self-selected) at the same time?

   (a) _____ Yes, all of the voting seats on the school PAC are filled at the same time and for the same terms of office.

   (b) _____ No, terms of office are staggered so that all of the voting members are not selected at the same point in time.

   (c) _____ There are no set terms of office for voting members of the school PAC.

7. Which of the following statements best describes the policy governing how long a member can serve on the school PAC? (Mark one.)

   (a) _____ A member can serve on the school PAC for only *one* term of office.

   (b) _____ A member can serve more than one term of office; however, these terms of office must be non-consecutive.

   (c) _____ A member can serve on the school PAC for a prescribed number of consecutive terms of office.

   (d) _____ A member can serve on the school PAC for an unrestricted number of consecutive terms of office or an unlimited amount of time.

8. Which of the following statements best describes the procedure customarily used to select school Title I PAC officers? Please answer this question first for the PAC chairperson and then for all other PAC officers.

	Elected to the position(s) (1)	Appointed to the position(s) (2)	Volunteered for the position(s) (3)
PAC chairperson			
Other PAC officers			

9. Please mark the statement which best describes the terms of office for school Title I PAC officers.

(a) ___ A school PAC officer can serve as an officer for only *one* term of office.

(b) ___ A school PAC officer can serve more than one term of office; however, these terms of office must be nonconsecutive.

(c) ___ A school PAC officer can serve in his or her position for a prescribed number of consecutive terms of office.

(d) ___ A school PAC officer can serve as an officer for an unrestricted number of consecutive terms of office or an unlimited amount of time.

10. How many formal business meetings of the *entire* school PAC will be held during the 1978-79 school year? (Include in your total the meetings which have already been held *plus* an estimate of the number of meetings which will be held between now and the end of the school year. Do *not* include workshops, training sessions, or seminars held for PAC members.)

___ Total number of formal business meetings this school year

11. Below are listed several activities often associated with the conduct of formal meetings of a school PAC. Please indicate, by checking the appropriate column, the person or group of persons who has *primary responsibility* for carrying out each activity on this school's PAC. If responsibility for a given activity is *shared equally* by two or more persons or groups, please check the appropriate columns for all persons or groups who share that responsibility.

	Title I Project Director (1)	Title I Parental Involvement Coordinator (2)	School Principal (3)	PAC Chair-person (4)	Other PAC officer(s) (5)	Other PAC member(s) (6)	Other (Please specify below.) (7)
(a) Preside at PAC meetings							
(b) Set PAC meeting agendas							
(c) Select PAC meeting sites							
(d) Select PAC meeting times							
(e) Review/approve PAC meeting minutes							

12. Below are listed some of the important management activities in which PACs may be engaged. Please indicate by checking the appropriate column the *level of authority* which the school's PAC exercises with regard to each activity. (Mark only one column for each activity.)

Management Activities	PAC has no advisory or decision-making role and no responsibility or no opportunity for involvement. (1)	PAC advises the LEA or school in making decisions; LEA or school has sole decision-making responsibility. (2)	Decision-making responsibility is jointly shared by PAC and LEA or school. (3)	PAC has exclusive or principal decision-making authority. (4)
(a) Developing the Title I project application				
(b) Conducting school-wide needs assessment for the Title I project				
(c) Planning specific components of the Title I project				
(d) Establishing goals and objectives for Title I project components				
(e) Monitoring implementation of Title I project components				
(f) Evaluating the extent to which goals and objectives for various project components are being met				
(g) Reviewing Title I school budget allocations for parental involvement activities				
(h) Reviewing other Title I school budget allocations				
(i) Signing off on Title I school budget allocations for parental involvement activities				
(j) Signing off on other Title I school budget allocations				
(k) Establishing eligibility requirements for employing parents with Title I funds				
(l) Selecting Title I professional staff (e.g., teachers, math/reading specialists, media resource specialists)				
(m) Selecting Title I paraprofessional staff (e.g., classroom aides, teaching assistants, playground/lunchroom aides, clerical assistants)				
(n) Evaluating Title I professional staff				
(o) Evaluating Title I paraprofessional staff				
(p) Handling staff and community complaints				
(q) Other (Please specify.) _____				

13. Are there *subcommittees* of this school's PAC which meet regularly for the purpose of handling certain aspects of PAC business? (Please consider an executive committee to be a subcommittee; do *not* consider an *ad hoc*, i.e., temporary, committee to be a subcommittee.)

___ Yes

___ No (Go on to Question 14.)

a. If yes, please indicate the number of subcommittees which have met regularly during the 1978-79 school year.

___ subcommittees have met regularly during the 1978-79 school year

b. If yes, what types of responsibilities have been delegated to these subcommittees (e.g., authority to decide upon PAC budget allocations, responsibility for monitoring or evaluating Title I project components)?

_____

_____

_____

_____

14. Indicate the total amount of this school PAC's *budget for operating expenses and activities* during the 1978-79 school year. (If none, enter zero.)

$ _____

15. How much of the money referred to in Question 14 is funding over which the school PAC has *direct control*? In other words, how much of this money can the PAC use at its own *discretion*? (If none, enter zero.)

$ _____

16. How many of the *voting* members presently serving on this *school's* PAC also serve as voting members on the district-level Title I PAC? (If none, enter zero.)

___ voting members also serve on the district-level Title I PAC

17. How many of the *voting* members presently serving on this *school's PAC* also serve as voting members on school-level advisory groups for the following federal programs? (If none, enter zero.)

___ serve on an Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) school-level advisory group

___ serve on an ESEA Title VII Bilingual school-level advisory group

___ serve on a Follow Through school-level advisory group

SECTION C.
PAID PARAPROFESSIONALS

Questions in this section are concerned with members of this school's paid paraprofessional staff whose salaries are paid primarily by Title I funds. If there are no such *Title I-funded paid paraprofessionals* at this school, check the box below and go on to Section D, Volunteers.

☐ No Title I-funded paid paraprofessionals

1. How many of the *paid paraprofessionals* currently employed at this school receive salaries paid primarily by Title I funds?

   ___ Number of Title I-funded paid paraprofessionals

2. How many of these Title I-funded paid paraprofessionals are *parents of children currently enrolled in this school*? (If none, enter zero and go on to Section D, Volunteers.)

   ___ Number of Title I-funded paid *parent* paraprofessionals

3. How many of these Title I-funded paid paraprofessionals are *parents of children who are currently being served* by the Title I project at this school? (If none, enter zero.)

   ___ Number of Title I-funded paid paraprofessionals who are parents of children being served

Questions 4 through 7 apply only to Title I-funded paid paraprofessionals who are *parents of children currently enrolled* in this school. These persons need *not* be parents of Title I children.

4. Listed below are some of the activities in which a paid paraprofessional might engage. Please go through the list and mark with a check each of those activities in which the Title I-funded paid parent paraprofessionals at this school actually do engage. Then go back and indicate with the numbers 1 and 2 the two activities engaged in most frequently by the Title I-funded paid parent paraprofessional staff.

   (a) ___ Relieving teachers of non-instructional duties or tasks (e.g., roll-taking, correcting papers)
   (b) ___ Assisting in the acquisition, preparation or retrieval of instructional materials
   (c) ___ Assisting in the operating or monitoring of classroom learning centers
   (d) ___ Working with individual children or small groups, reviewing or reteaching skills and concepts they have already learned
   (e) ___ Giving special assistance to children with particular academic difficulties or weaknesses
   (f) ___ Enriching the curriculum in areas requiring special skills or unique experiences
   (g) ___ Assisting in the teaching of new skills or concepts to the children
   (h) ___ Assisting in the non-classroom components of the school program (e.g., library, playground, field trips)
   (i) ___ Other (Please specify.)_____

5. In the columns below are listed several activities related to the hiring of Title I-funded paid parent paraprofessionals. Please indicate, by checking the appropriate row, who has *primary* responsibility for carrying out each activity at this school.

	Setting of selection criteria (1)	Nomination of candidates (2)	Interviewing of candidates (3)	Final selection of paid parent paraprofessionals (4)
(a) School principal				
(b) Teacher or other school-level professional staff				
(c) Paid paraprofessional staff				
(d) Title I Parent Advisory Council				
(e) Special hiring committee that includes parent members				
(f) Special hiring committee that does not include parent members				
(g) District personnel officer or other district administrative staff				
(h) Other (Please specify.) _____ _____				

You have just been answering questions about all of the parent paraprofessionals in this school whose salaries are paid primarily by Title I funds. Questions 6 and 7 are concerned only with the parent paraprofessionals paid with Title I funds who *work directly with children as part of the instructional process.* (If none of the Title I-funded paid parent paraprofessionals works directly with children as part of the instructional process, check here and go on to Section D, Volunteers. ___)

6. What percentage of the Title I-funded parent paraprofessionals who started this school year *working directly with children* as part of the instructional process have remained on staff at this school?

___ % of those who started the school year remain on staff

7. How many hours of *formal training* (e.g., workshops, conferences, seminars, supervised on-the-job training) will the typical paid parent paraprofessional who works directly with children as part of the instructional process be provided during the 1978-79 school year through the Title I project? (If none, enter zero.)

___ Number of hours of formal training

SECTION D.
VOLUNTEERS

Questions in this section are concerned with the volunteer component of the Title I program. More specifically, we are interested in those Title I volunteers who work within the school's educational program. If there are no such *Title I volunteers* at this school, check the box below and go on to Section E, Parents as Teachers for Their Own Children.

☐ No Title I volunteers who work within the school's educational program

1. Please estimate the number of volunteers who work within this school's educational program on an on-going basis as part of the Title I project.

   ___ Number of Title I volunteers who work within the school's educational program

2. How many of these Title I-supported volunteers are *parents of children currently enrolled in this school*? (If none, enter zero and go on to Section E, Parents as Teachers for Their Own Children.)

   ___ Number of Title I *parent* volunteers who work within the school's educational program

3. How many hours of *formal training* (e.g., workshops, conferences, seminars, supervised on-the-job training) will the typical parent volunteer who works within the school's educational program receive during the 1978-79 school year as part of the Title I project? (If none, enter zero.)

   ___ Number of hours of formal training

4. Listed below are some of the activities in which a Title I parent volunteer might engage. Please go through the list and mark with a check each of those activities in which Title I parent volunteers at this school actually do engage. Then go back and indicate with the numbers 1 and 2 the two activities engaged in most frequently by these Title I parent volunteers.

   (a) ___ Relieving teachers of non-instructional duties or tasks (e.g., roll-taking, correcting papers)
   (b) ___ Assisting in the acquisition, preparation or retrieval of instructional materials
   (c) ___ Assisting in the operation or monitoring of classroom learning centers
   (d) ___ Working with individual children or small groups, reviewing or reteaching skills and concepts they have already learned
   (e) ___ Giving special assistance to children with particular academic difficulties or weaknesses
   (f) ___ Enriching the curriculum in areas requiring special skills or unique experiences
   (g) ___ Assisting in the teaching of new skills or concepts to the children
   (h) ___ Assisting in the non-classroom components of the school program (e.g., library, playground, field trips)
   (i) ___ Other (Please specify.) _____

5. Following are several possible methods for providing compensation to parents for expenses they incur while volunteering their time and services at a school. Please mark with a check each method that is used within the Title I project at this school to defray the expenses incurred by parent volunteers. Then go back and indicate with the number 1 the method of compensation used most frequently.

(a) ___ Parent volunteers are provided with in-kind services (e.g., child care, babysitting).

(b) ___ Parent volunteers are reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses (e.g., transportation).

(c) ___ Parent volunteers receive stipends to defray all or part of the expenses they incur.

(d) ___ Other (Please specify.) _____

_____

(e) ___ No money or services are provided to defray expenses incurred by parent volunteers.

SECTION E.
PARENTS AS TEACHERS FOR THEIR OWN CHILDREN

The single question in this section is concerned with efforts of the school's Title I project to involve parents in the educational process as teachers for their own children in the home.

1. Following are several activities and services that might be provided to parents who teach their own children at home as part of the Title I project. Please go through the list and mark with a check each of the activities and services which has been provided by this school's Title I project during the 1978-79 school year. (Mark all that apply.)

(a) ___ Group training sessions (held, for example, at school, at the district office, in a parent's home)

(b) ___ Workshops in which parents are assisted in making educational games and other instructional materials for use at home with their children

(c) ___ Individual training sessions

(d) ___ Specially prepared materials that are sent home for parents' use with their children

(e) ___ Written handouts (e.g., pamphlets, handbooks) intended for individual home study

(f) ___ Other (Please specify.) _____

_____

(g) ___ No activities or services are provided.

SECTION F.

COORDINATION/PROMOTION OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Questions in this section are concerned with the person or group of persons *at this school* who coordinates or promotes parental involvement activities. This person(s) might have responsibilities such as: informing parents about district or school activities or policies, serving as a mediator or arbitrator between parents and the district and/or school, or coordinating training or education programs for parents. In responding to this section, please *do not include* any person(s) who coordinates or promotes parental involvement activities at more than one school or is considered to be a district-level parental involvement specialist or coordinator. If there is no person at this school who is responsible for coordinating and/or promoting parental involvement activities, check the box below and go on to Section G, School Funding.

☐ No person responsible for coordinating and/or promoting parental involvement activities

1. How many persons are there at this school who serve *full-time* to coordinate or promote parental involvement activities? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 5.)

   ___ Number of full-time parental involvement coordinators

2. How many of these full-time parental involvement coordinators spend time on activities related to parental involvement *within th. itle I project*? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 5.)

   ___ Number of full-time parental i vement coordinators who spend time on Title I parental involvement activities

3. Please estimate the *total* number of hours per week spent by these full-time parental involvement coordinators on activities related to parental involvement within the Title I project.

   ___ Hours per week spent on Title I parental involvement activities

4. Do the parental involvement coordinators associated with the Title I project at this school also serve any other federal program?

   ___ No (Go on to Question 5.)
   ___ Yes

   a. If yes, indicate which of the following programs, in addition to Title I, are served by these parental involvement coordinators.

      _____ ESEA Title VII Bilingual
      _____ ESAA
      _____ Follow Through
      _____ Other (Please specify.) _____

You have just been answering questions about full-time parental involvement coordinators who spend at least some of their time on Title I parental involvement activities. Questions 5 and 6 ask about persons who are *not full-time* parental involvement coordinators but whose *responsibilities nonetheless include* coordinating and/or promoting Title I parental involvement activities.

5. How many persons are there at this school who are *not full-time* parental involvement coordinators but whose responsibilities include coordinating and/or promoting parental involvement activities associated with the Title I project? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 7.)

   ___ Number of persons who are not full-time parental involvement coordinators but whose responsibilities include coordinating and/or promoting Title I parental involvement activities at this school

6. Please estimate the *total* number of hours per week spent by the persons identified in Question 5 on activities related to parental involvement within the Title I project.

   ___ Hours per week spent on Title I parental involvement activities

7. Listed below are some activities in which persons (whether working full-time or part-time) who are responsible for coordinating and/or promoting parental involvement activities might engage. Please go through the list and mark with a check each of those activities in which the person(s) responsible for coordinating and/or promoting parental involvement activities within this school's Title I project actually engages. Then go back and indicate with the numbers *1* and *2* the two activities engaged in most frequently by this person(s).

   (a) ___ Visit parents in their homes to inform them about district or school activities and policies
   (b) ___ Participate in meetings to inform parents about district or school activities and policies
   (c) ___ Conduct workshops to inform parents about the regulations and guidelines for the Title I program
   (d) ___ Serve as an advocate for parents before district, school and community
   (e) ___ Serve as an advocate for the district and/or school to the parents
   (f) ___ Serve as an arbitrator between parents and the district and/or school
   (g) ___ Recruit parents for involvement in Title I district or school activities (e.g., district or school parent advisory councils, paid paraprofessional positions, volunteer positions, home tutors)
   (h) ___ Help to organize and/or to run parent education programs
   (i) ___ Coordinate training activities for parents (e.g., workshops, conferences, seminars)
   (j) ___ Provide counsel for parents concerning school-related problems
   (k) ___ Provide counsel for parents concerning family relationships
   (l) ___ Help parents to locate services within the community (e.g., medical services, community mental health services, welfare)
   (m) ___ Provide informal opportunities for parents and district and/or school personnel to interact
   (n) ___ Other (Please specify.) _____

SECTION G.
SCHOOL FUNDING

Please answer the following questions about funding this school is receiving during the 1978-79 school year.

1. Is this school receiving the following types of funding for the 1978-79 school year? (Mark "yes" or "no" for each type of funding.)

YES	*NO*	
___	___	ESAA
___	___	ESEA Title VII Bilingual
___	___	Follow Through
___	___	The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142)
___	___	Other Federal (excluding Title I funding)
___	___	State (Categorical funds)

2. How many years (including 1978-79) has this school received Title I funds?

___ Number of years

3. Indicate the total amount of Title I funds that will be used to provide services for this school during the 1978-79 school year.

$___

4. How many students will receive services supported by Title I funds *at this school* during the 1978-79 school year? First, indicate the total number of *students enrolled in this school* who will receive services supported by Title I funds. Then, indicate the total number of *non-public school students* who will receive Title I services at this school.

___ Number of students enrolled in this school who will receive Title I services during the school year

___ Number of non-public school students who will receive Title I services at this school during the school year

You have now completed the formal portion of the questionnaire. The System Development Corporation person who will be calling to record your responses to these questions will also be anxious to talk with you about any other significant parental involvement activities that occur at this school as part of the Title I project. *Please use the space below to jot down any comments that you would like to share with us* about this school's Titie I parental involvement activities.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

FEDAC Clearance No. S-9
Expiration date: 4/80

ESAA PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

DISTRICT-LEVEL

As a vital part of the Study of Parental Involvement in Four Federal Education Programs, this questionnaire is designed to collect information related to ESAA-supported parental involvement activities in your district. Although parental participation is considered a valued aspect of several federal educational programs including ESAA, little is actually known about the nature and extent of such participation. The present study is being conducted by System Development Corporation (SDC) in direct response to a congressional request for systematic, descriptive information on parental involvement in major federal educational programs, and to similar requests by federal program offices. In addition, the results of the Study will be extremely helpful to local school people and parents who are attempting to promote parental involvement in their districts and schools. All responses to this questionnaire will be treated in accordance with federal privacy acts; results will not be reported in a form identifiable with any person, school, or district.

This questionnaire requests descriptive information about your district as well as information about two parental involvement program components. More specifically, it is organized into the following four sections:

SECTION A.	District Descriptive Information
SECTION B.	Supervision/Coordination of Parental Involvement Activities
SECTION C.	District-wide ESAA Advisory Committees
SECTION D.	ESAA-funded Nonprofit Organizations

To answer some of the questions contained in these sections, you may need to consult with other personnel in the district office. We would appreciate your gathering the information needed to complete this questionnaire at your earliest convenience. A member of the study staff will be contacting you by telephone in the next few weeks to record your answers.

This study is sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education's Office of Evaluation and Dissemination. While you are not required to participate, your cooperation is needed to make the results of the study comprehensive, accurate, and timely.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

SECTION A.

DISTRICT DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

Please answer the following questions about your district. Many of these questions relate specifically to the district's ESAA program. We understand that in some districts, ESAA program funds may come from different grant sources (such as Basic, Pilot, and Magnet school grants) and that money from these different grants may be used to run separate projects (with, for example, separate budgets and separate staffs). For the purposes of this questionnaire, please treat all items asking about the ESAA program in your district as referring to activities or services supported by *Basic, Pilot, and/or Magnet school grants only*. Exclude activities or services supported by other ESAA sources (e.g., Bilingual, Special Arts, Special Compensatory). We realize that in certain districts this approach may require respondents to consolidate information for as many as three separate ESAA project components -- that is, Basic, Pilot, and Magnet. However, the design of this study necessitates such consolidated information.

If you are completing questionnaires for more than one federally funded program within your district, the first three items should be completed only once. If you have already answered these questions, go on to *Question 4* in Section A, District Descriptive Information.

1. What is your district's estimated 1978-79 *per pupil expenditure* for the elementary grades?

   $ _____

2. Indicate the total amount of each type of federal funding listed below that your district is receiving during the 1978-79 school year. (If no money is being received from a particular source, enter zero.)

   $ _____ ESAA Basic
   $ _____ ESAA Pilot
   $ _____ ESAA Magnet
   $ _____ ESAA (Total from *all* ESAA grants)
   $ _____ Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I
   $ _____ Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title VII Bilingual
   $ _____ Follow Through

3. Within your district, which, if any, of the following federal programs provide services to *non-public school students*? (Mark all that apply.)

   _____ ESAA
   _____ Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I
   _____ Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title VII Bilingual
   _____ Follow Through

4. Do any of your district's ESAA budgets for Basic, Pilot and/or Magnet projects include *line items* for parental involvement?

_____ Yes

_____ No (Go on to Section B, Supervision/Coordination of Parental Involvement Activities.)

a. If yes, please indicate the amounts of the parental involvement line items for the 1978-79 school year. (If no money is being received from a particular source, leave the space corresponding to that source blank; if there is no line item for a particular source, enter zero.)

$ _____ ESAA Basic

$ _____ ESAA Pilot

$ _____ ESAA Magnet

b. If yes, what types of services and/or activities are supported within the parental involvement budget categories (e.g., District-wide Advisory Committee, school-level advisory committees, parental involvement specialist, school-parent liaison, paid parent paraprofessionals, parent volunteer program, home tutoring program)?

_____

_____

_____

_____

SECTION B.

SUPERVISION/COORDINATION OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Questions in this section are concerned with the person or group of persons who might operate *at the district level* to supervise and/or coordinate parental involvement activities. This person(s) might have responsibilities such as informing parents about district or school activities or policies, coordinating training or education programs for parents, or serving as a mediator or arbitrator between parents and the district and/or school. If there is a person or group of persons whose responsibilities include supervising and/or coordinating parental involvement activities at the school level *but who operates at more than one school*, please consider the person(s) to be a district-level staff person(s) and answer the questions in this section about that person(s). In responding to the questions that refer specifically to supervision and/or coordination of ESAA parental involvement activities, please include *all* district-level persons whose responsibilities encompass supervising and/or coordinating such activities for Basic, Pilot, and/or Magnet projects. If there is no person in your district who is responsible for supervising and/or coordinating parental involvement activities, check the box below and go on to Section C, District-wide ESAA Advisory Committees.

☐ No person responsible for supervising and/or coordinating parental involvement activities

1. How many persons are there at the district level who serve as *full-time* parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 5.)

   _____ Number of full-time parental involvement specialists/parent coordinators

2. How many of these full-time, district-level parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators spend time on activities related to parental involvement *within the ESAA program* (i.e., Basic, Pilot and/or Magnet projects)? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 5.)

   _____ Number of full-time parental involvement specialists/parent coordinators who spend time on ESAA parental involvement activities

3. Please estimate the *total* number of hours per week spent by these full-time parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators on activities related to parental involvement within the ESAA program.

   _____ Hours per week spent on ESAA parental involvement activities

4. Do the district-level parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators associated with the ESAA program also serve any other federal program?

   _____ No (Go on to Question 5.)

   _____ Yes

   a. If yes, indicate which of the following programs, in addition to ESAA, are served by these district-level parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators.

      _____ ESEA Title VII Bilingual
      _____ ESEA Title I
      _____ Follow Through
      _____ Other (Please specify.) _____

You have just been answering questions about full-time parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators who spend at least some of their time on ESAA parental involvement activities. Questions 5 and 6 ask about persons who are *not full-time* parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators but whose *responsibilities nonetheless include* supervising and/or coordinating ESAA parental involvement activities.

5. How many persons are there at the district level who are *not full-time* parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators but whose responsibilities include supervising and/or coordinating parental involvement activities associated with the ESAA program? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 7.)

   _____ Number of persons who are not full-time parental involvement specialists/coordinators but whose responsibilities include supervising and/or coordinating ESAA parental involvement activities

6. Please estimate the *total* number of hours per week spent by the persons identified in Question 5 on activities related to parental involvement within the ESAA program.

   _____ Hours per week spent on ESAA parental involvement activities

7. Listed below are some activities in which persons (whether working full-time or part-time) who are responsible for supervising and/or coordinating parental involvement activities might engage. Please go through the list and mark with a check each of those activities in which the district-level person(s) responsible for coordinating and/or supervising parental involvement activities within the ESAA program actually engages. Then go back and indicate with the numbers 1 and 2 the two activities engaged in most frequently by this person(s).

   (a) _____ Coordinate visitations to parents to inform them about district or school activities or policies
   (b) _____ Participate in meetings to inform parents about district or school activities or policies
   (c) _____ Coordinate activities for parents to train them and/or inform them about regulations and guidelines for the ESAA program (e.g., workshops, conferences, seminars)
   (d) _____ Help to organize and/or to run parent education programs
   (e) _____ Participate in in-service training intended to help school professional and/or paraprofessional staff deal with special problems of minority group students
   (f) _____ Coordinate a program to provide counsel for parents concerning family relationships
   (g) _____ Recruit parents for involvement in ESAA district or school activities (e.g., district or school advisory committees, paid paraprofessional positions, volunteer positions, home tutors)
   (h) _____ Serve as an advocate for parents before district and school administration
   (i) _____ Serve as an advocate for the district and/or school to the parents
   (j) _____ Serve as an arbitrator between parents and district and/or school
   (k) _____ Provide informal opportunities for parents and district and/or school personnel to interact
   (l) _____ Other (Please specify.) _____

SECTION C.
DISTRICT-WIDE ESAA ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Questions in this section are concerned with District-wide Advisory Committees which are associated with the management of ESAA projects. If there is no such district-wide committee for ESAA in your district, check the box below and go on to Section D, ESAA-funded Nonprofit Organizations.

☐ No District-wide Advisory Committee

1. How many *voting* members are serving on your district's ESAA Advisory Committee during the 1978-79 School year?

_____ Number of voting members

2. Indicate the number of *voting parent* members presently serving on the district ESAA Advisory Committee who belong to the following racial/ethnic groups.

_____ American Indian or Alaskan Native
_____ Asian or Pacific Islander
_____ Black, not of Hispanic origin
_____ Hispanic
_____ White, not of Hispanic origin
_____ Total number of voting parent members

3. How many of the voting members presently serving on the district ESAA Advisory Committee are parents of children who are currently *receiving ESAA services* in the district?

_____ Number of voting members who are parents of children being served

4. For each category of district Advisory Committee members listed below, please indicate 1) whether the members from this category are customarily *elected*, *appointed*, or *self-selected* (i.e., volunteers), *and* 2) whether the members customarily hold *voting* or *non-voting* memberships on the district Advisory Committee. (If a category of individuals is not represented on your district Advisory Committee, leave the spaces corresponding to that category blank.)

Categories (Roles) of Individuals	Elected (1)	Appointed (2)	Volunteer (3)	Voting (4)	Non-voting (5)
(a) Parents of students served by the ESAA program					
(b) Parents of other students attending school in this district					
(c) Students					
(d) Professional school personnel					
(e) Paid Aides and Assistants					
(f) Representatives of non-public schools					
(g) Representatives of community organizations (e.g., civic, business, church)					

5. Is the entire *voting* membership of the district Advisory Committee selected (e.g.,elected, appointed, self-selected) at the same time?

(a) _____ Yes, all of the voting seats on the district Advisory Committee are filled at the same time and for the same terms of office.

(b) _____ No, terms of office are staggered so that all of the voting members are not selected at the same point in time.

(c) _____ There are no set terms of office for voting members of the district Advisory Committee.

6. Which of the following statements best describes the policy governing how long a member can serve on your district's Advisory Committee? (Mark one.)

(a) _____ A member can serve on the district Advisory Committee for only *one* term of office.

(b) _____ A member can serve more than one term of office; however, these terms of office must be non-consecutive.

(c) _____ A member can serve on the district Advisory Committee for a prescribed number of consecutive terms of office.

(d) _____ A member can serve on the district Advisory Committee for an unrestricted number of consecutive terms of office or an unlimited amount of time.

7. Which of the following statements best describes the procedure customarily used to select district Advisory Committee officers? Please answer this question first for the Advisory Committee chairperson and then for all other Advisory Committee officers.

	Elected to the position(s) (1)	Appointed to the position(s) (2)	Volunteered for the position(s) (3)
Advisory Committee Chairperson			
Other Advisory Committee officers			

8. Please mark the statement which best describes the terms of office for district Advisory Committee officers.

(a) _____ A district Advisory Committee officer can serve as an officer for only *one* term of office.

(b) _____ A district Advisory Committee officer can serve more than one term of office; however, these terms of office must be non-consecutive.

(c) _____ A district Advisory Committee officer can serve in his or her position for a prescribed number of consecutive terms of office.

(d) _____ A district Advisory Committee officer can serve for an unrestricted number of consecutive terms of office or an unlimited amount of time.

9. How many formal business meetings of the *entire* district Advisory Committee will be held during the 1978-79 school year? (Include in your total the meetings which have already been held *plus* an estimate of the number of meetings which will be held between now and the end of the school year. Do *not* include workshops, training sessions or seminars held for Advisory Committee members.)

_____ Total number of formal business meetings this school year

10. Below are listed several activities often associated with the conduct of formal meetings of a district Advisory Committee. Please indicate, by checking the appropriate column, the person or group of persons who has *primary responsibility* for carrying out each activity on your district's Advisory Committee. If responsibility for a given activity is *shared equally* by two or more persons or groups, please check the appropriate columns for all persons or groups who share that responsibility.

	ESAA Project Director (1)	ESAA Parent Coordinator/ Parental Involvement Specialist (2)	Advisory Committee Chairperson (3)	Other Advisory Committee Officer(s) (4)	Other Advisory Committee Member(s) (5)	(6)
(a) Preside at Advisory Committee meetings						
(b) Set Advisory Committee meeting agendas						
(c) Select Advisory Committee meeting sites						
(d) Select Advisory Committee meeting times						
(e) Review/approve Advisory Committee meeting minutes						

11. Below are listed some of the important management activities in which district Advisory Committees may be engaged. Please indicate by checking the appropriate column the *level of authority* which your district Advisory Committee exercises with regard to each activity. (Mark only one column for each activity.)

Management Activities	Advisory Committee has no advisory or decision-making role and no responsibility or no opportunity for involvement. (1)	Advisory Committee advises the LEA in making decisions; LEA has sole decision-making responsibility. (2)	Decision-making responsibility is jointly shared by Advisory Committee and LEA. (3)	Advisory Committee has exclusive or principal decision-making authority. (4)
(a) Developing the ESAA project application				
(b) Conducting district-wide needs assessment for the ESAA project				
(c) Planning specific components of the ESAA project (e.g., activities to facilitate the desegregation plan, or to reduce minority group isolation)				
(d) Establishing goals and objectives for ESAA project components				
(e) Monitoring implementation of ESAA project components				
(f) Evaluating the extent to which goals and objectives for various project components are being met				
(g) Reviewing ESAA district budget allocations for parental involvement activities				
(h) Reviewing other ESAA district budget allocations				
(i) Signing off on ESAA district budget allocations for parental involvement activities				
(j) Signing off on other ESAA district budget allocations				
(k) Establishing eligibility requirements for employing parents with ESAA funds				
(l) Selecting ESAA professional staff (e.g., teachers, math/reading specialists, media resource specialists)				
(m) Selecting ESAA paraprofessional staff (e.g., classroom aides, teaching assistants, playground/lunchroom aides, clerical assistants)				
(n) Evaluating ESAA professional staff				
(o) Evaluating ESAA paraprofessional staff				
(p) Handling staff and community complaints				
(q) Other (Please specify.)_____				

10

12. Are there *subcommittees* of your district's Advisory Committee which meet regularly for the purpose of handling certain aspects of Advisory Committee business? (Please consider an executive committee to be a subcommittee; do *not* consider an *ad hoc*, i.e., temporary, committee to be a subcommittee.)

_____ Yes

_____ No (Go on to Question 13.)

a. If yes, please indicate the number of subcommittees which have met regularly during the 1978-79 school year.

_____ subcommittees have met regularly during the 1978-79 school year

b. If yes, what types of responsibilities have been delegated to these subcommittees (e.g., authority to decide upon Advisory Committee budget allocations, responsibility for monitoring or evaluating ESAA program components)?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. Indicate the total amount of your district Advisory Committee's *budget for operating expenses and activities* during the 1978-79 school year. (If none, enter zero.)

$ _____

14. How much of the money referred to in Question 13 is funding over which the district Advisory Committee has *direct control*? In other words, how much of this money can the district Advisory Committee use at its own *discretion*? (If none, enter zero)

$ _____

15. How many of the *voting* members presently serving on your *district's Advisory Committee* also serve as voting members on district-level advisory groups for the following federal programs? (If none, enter zero.)

_____ serve on an ESEA Title I district-level advisory group

_____ serve on an ESEA Title VII Bilingual district-level advisory group

_____ serve on a Follow Through district-level advisory group

Although ESAA advisory committees are mandated at only the district level, they are sometimes instituted at other levels as well. The last three questions in this section ask about the extent to which advisory committees associated with the ESAA program exist beyond the district level.

16. Approximately what percentage of the schools in your district that receive ESAA funds have school-level ESAA advisory committees? (If no school-level ESAA advisory committees exist in your district, check here and go on to Question 18. _____)

    _____ % of the ESAA-funded schools have school-level ESAA advisory committees

17. How many of the *voting* members presently serving on your District-wide Advisory Committee also serve as voting members on school-level ESAA advisory committees? (If none, enter zero.)

    _____ serve on school-level ESAA advisory committees

18. We are also interested in advisory committees, other than district-wide or school-level, which serve the ESAA projects operating in your district or in schools within your district. Which, if any, of the following types of advisory committees serve the ESAA program? (Mark all that apply.)

    _____ Regional (i.e., advisory committees that consist of members from more than one district within a state)

    _____ County

    _____ Intermediate (i.e., advisory committees that consist of members from more than one school within a district)

    _____ Other (Please specify.) _____

SECTION D.

ESAA-FUNDED NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

Questions in this section are concerned with ESAA-funded Nonprofit Organizations (NPOs) that operate within your district to support school desegregation programs, reduce minority group isolation, or aid school children in overcoming the educational disadvantages of minority group isolation. If no ESAA-funded NPOs operate within your district, check the box below.

☐ No ESAA-funded NPOs

(This completes the formal portion of the questionnaire. Please turn to page 14.)

1. Please list all ESAA-funded NPOs that have provided services within your district during the 1978-79 school year.

_____

_____

_____

2. We are interested in identifying activities or services provided by these ESAA-funded NPOs at the *district level* for the purpose of involving parents in the educational process or in any aspect of the ESAA program. We realize that because of the varied nature of ESAA-funded NPOs, there may be a wide range of such parental involvement activities provided to your district by NPOs. These activities might include (but are not limited to) educating parents about federal, state, or locally funded educational programs; involving parents in counseling/guidance or career orientation programs; or serving as a liaison between parents and the district or school administration. In the space below, please list all parental involvement activities provided to your district by ESAA-funded NPOs. Please be as specific and detailed as possible. Then, go back and indicate with the numbers *1* and *2* the two parental involvement activities provided most frequently by these ESAA-funded NPOs.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

You have now completed the formal portion of this questionnaire. The System Development Corporation person who will be calling to record your responses to these questions will also be anxious to talk with you about any other significant parental involvement activities that occur at the district level as part of the ESAA program. *Please use the space below to jot down any comments that you would like to share with us* about your district's ESAA parental involvement activities.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

FEDAC Clearance No. S-9
Effective date: 4/80

ESAA PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

SCHOOL-LEVEL

As a vital part of the Study of Parental Involvement in Four Federal Education Programs, this questionnaire is designed to collect information related to ESAA-supported parental involvement activities in your school. Although parental participation is considered a valued aspect of several federal educational programs including ESAA, little is actually known about the nature and extent of such participation. The present study is being conducted by System Development Corporation (SDC) in direct response to a congressional request for systematic, descriptive information on parental participation in major federal educational programs, and to similar requests by federal program offices. In addition, the results of the study will be extremely helpful to local school people and parents who are attempting to promote parental involvement in their districts and schools. All responses to this questionnaire will be treated in accordance with federal privacy acts; results will not be reported in a form identifiable with any person, school, or district.

This questionnaire requests descriptive information about the school identified above, as well as information about several parental involvement program components. More specifically, it is organized into the following seven sections:

SECTION A.	School Descriptive Information
SECTION B.	Paid Paraprofessionals
SECTION C.	Volunteers
SECTION D.	Parents as Teachers for Their Own Children
SECTION E.	Coordination/Promotion of Parental Involvement Activities
SECTION F.	ESAA-funded Nonprofit Organizations
SECTION G.	School Funding

To answer some of the questions contained in these sections, you may need to consult with personnel at the school. We would appreciate your gathering the information needed to complete this questionnaire at your earliest convenience. A member of the study staff will be contacting you by telephone in the next few weeks to record your answers.

This study is sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education's Office of Evaluation and Dissemination. While you are not required to participate, your cooperation is needed to make the results of the study comprehensive, accurate, and timely.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

SECTION A.

SCHOOL DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

Please answer the following questions about the school named on the front of this questionnaire. Many of these questions relate specifically to the school's ESAA program. We understand that in some schools, ESAA program funds may come from different grant sources (such as Basic, Pilot and Magnet school grants). For the purposes of this questionnaire, please treat all items asking about the ESAA project at this school as referring to activities or services supported by *Basic, Pilot, and/or Magnet grants only*. Exclude activities or services supported by other ESAA sources (e.g., Bilingual, Special Arts, Special Compensatory). We realize that in certain schools this approach may require respondents to consolidate information for as many as three separate ESAA components – that is, Basic, Pilot, and Magnet. However, the design of this study necessitates such consolidated information.

If you are completing questionnaires for more than one federally funded program within the school, the first five items should be completed only once. If you have already answered these questions, go on to *Question 6* in Section A, School Descriptive Information.

1. Please indicate which of the following ESAA grant sources is providing funds to *this school* for the 1978-79 school year. (Mark all that apply.)

   _____ ESAA Basic
   _____ ESAA Pilot
   _____ ESAA Magnet
   _____ Other ESAA (Please specify.) _____

   _____

2. As of October 1, 1978, indicate the number of students in this school enrolled in each of the grades listed below. (If this school does not contain a particular grade level, enter zero.)

_____ Kindergarten	_____ Grade 4	_____ Grade 8
_____ Grade 1	_____ Grade 5	_____ Grades 9-12
_____ Grade 2	_____ Grade 6	_____ Other
_____ Grade 3	_____ Grade 7	_____ Total Enrollment

3. What percentage of the students in this school are considered to be low-income students?

   _____ % of students

   a. What criterion did you use to estimate the above percentage of low-income students in the school (e.g., students eligible for free or reduced price lunch, students from families eligible for Aid to Families with Dependent Children)?

   _____

4. Please indicate your estimate of the percentage of students enrolled in this school who live with parents or guardians whose home language is not English.

   _____ % of students

5. Which of the following best describes the location of this school? (Mark one.)

(a) _____ Large city, over 200,000 population
(b) _____ Suburb of a large city
(c) _____ Middle-size city, 50,000 to 200,000 population
(d) _____ Suburb of a middle-size city
(e) _____ Small city or town less than 50,000 population
(f) _____ Rural area near a large or middle-size city
(g) _____ Rural area, not near a large or middle-size city

The following questions ask about school-level ESAA advisory committees. Although such committees are not mandated at the school level, we are interested in whether or not one has been instituted at this school.

6. Is there an ESAA advisory committee at this school?

_____ No (Go on to Section B, Paid Paraprofessionals.)
_____ Yes

7. For each category of school ESAA advisory committee members listed below, please indicate 1) whether the members from this category are customarily *elected*, *appointed*, or *self-selected* (i.e., volunteers), *and* 2) whether the members customarily hold *voting* or *non-voting* memberships on the school advisory committee. (If a category of individuals is not represented on the school advisory committee, leave the spaces corresponding to that category blank.)

Categories (Roles) of Individuals	Elected (1)	Appointed (2)	Volunteer (3)	Voting (4)	Non-voting (5)
(a) Parents of students served by the ESAA project					
(b) Parents of other students attending the school					
(c) Students					
(d) Professional school personnel					
(e) Paid Aides and Assistants					
(f) Representatives of non-public schools					
(g) Representatives of community organizations (e.g., civic, business, church)					

SECTION B.
PAID PARAPROFESSIONALS

Questions in this section are concerned with members of this school's paid paraprofessional staff whose salaries are paid primarily by ESAA funds. If there are no such *ESAA-funded paid paraprofessionals* at this school, check the box below and go on to Section C, Volunteers.

☐ No ESAA-funded paid paraprofessionals

1. How many of the *paid paraprofessionals* currently employed at this school receive salaries paid primarily by ESAA funds?

_____ Number of ESAA-funded paid paraprofessionals

2. How many of these ESAA-funded paid paraprofessionals are *parents of children currently enrolled in this school*? (If none, enter zero and go on to Section C, Volunteers.)

_____ Number of ESAA-funded paid *parent* paraprofessionals

3. How many of these ESAA-funded paid paraprofessionals are *parents of children who are currently being served* by the ESAA project at this school? (If none, enter zero.)

_____ Number of ESAA-funded paid paraprofessionals who are parents of children being served

4. Please indicate the number of ESAA paid paraprofessionals at this school belonging to each racial/ethnic group listed below. First, indicate the racial/ethnic backgrounds of all ESAA paid paraprofessionals. Then, indicate the racial/ethnic backgrounds of all ESAA paid *parent* paraprofessionals.

Racial/Ethnic Background	Paid Paraprofessionals	Paid Parent Paraprofessionals
American Indian or Alaskan Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, not of Hispanic origin		
Hispanic		
White, not of Hispanic origin		

Questions 5 through 8 apply only to ESAA-funded paid paraprofessionals who are *parents of children currently enrolled* in this school. These persons need *not* be parents of ESAA children.

5. Listed below are some of the activities in which a paid paraprofessional might engage. Please go through the list and mark with a check each of those activities in which the ESAA-funded paid parent paraprofessionals at this school actually do engage. Then go back and indicate with the numbers *1* and *2* the two activities engaged in most frequently by the ESAA-funded paid parent paraprofessional staff.

(a) _____ Relieving teachers of non-instructional duties or tasks (e.g., roll-taking, correcting papers)

(b) _____ Assisting in the acquisition, preparation or retrieval of instructional materials

(c) _____ Assisting in the operating or monitoring of classroom learning centers

(d) _____ Working with individual children or small groups, reviewing or reteaching skills and concepts they have already learned

(e) _____ Giving special assistance to children with particular academic difficulties or weaknesses

(f) _____ Enriching the curriculum in areas requiring special skills or unique experiences (e.g., activities and/or instruction related to minority cultural backgrounds)

(g) _____ Assisting in the teaching of new skills or concepts to the children

(h) _____ Assisting in the non-classroom components of the school program (e.g., library, playground, field trips)

(i) _____ Planning and/or participating in special activities with multi-cultural themes (e.g., assemblies, fiestas, carnivals)

(j) _____ Other (Please specify.) _____

6. In the columns below are listed several activities related to the hiring of ESAA-funded paid parent paraprofessionals. Please indicate, by checking the appropriate row, who has *primary* responsibility for carrying out each activity at this school.

	Setting of selection criteria (1)	Nomination of candidates (2)	Interviewing of candidates (3)	Final selection of paid parent paraprofessionals (4)
(a) School principal				
(b) Teacher or other school-level professional staff				
(c) Paid paraprofessional staff				
(d) ESAA District-wide Advisory Committee				
(e) Special hiring committee that includes parent members				
(f) Special hiring committee that does not include parent members				
(g) District personnel officer or other district administrative staff				
(h) Other (Please specify.) _____				

You have just been answering questions about all of the parent paraprofessionals in this school whose salaries are paid primarily by ESAA funds. Questions 7 and 8 are concerned only with the parent paraprofessionals paid with ESAA funds who *work directly with children as part of the instructional process.* (If none of the ESAA-funded paid parent paraprofessionals works directly with children as part of the instructional process, check here and go on to Section C, Volunteers. _____)

7. What percentage of the ESAA-funded parent paraprofessionals who started this school year *working directly with children* as part of the instructional process have remained on staff at this school?

_____% of those who started the school year remain on staff

8. How many hours of *formal training* (e.g., workshops, conferences, seminars, supervised on-the-job training) will the typical paid parent paraprofessional who works directly with children as part of the instructional process be provided during the 1978-79 school year through the ESAA project? (If none, enter zero.)

_____ Number of hours of formal training

SECTION C.
VOLUNTEERS

Questions in this section are concerned with the volunteer component of the ESAA program. More specifically, we are interested in those ESAA volunteers who work within the school's educational program. If there are no such *ESAA volunteers* at this school, check the box below and go on to Section D, Parents as Teachers for Their Own Children.

☐ No ESAA volunteers who work within the school's educational program

1. Please estimate the number of volunteers who work within this school's educational program on an on-going basis as part of the ESAA project.

_____ Number of ESAA volunteers who work within the school's educational program

2. How many of these ESAA-supported volunteers are *parents of children currently enrolled in this school*? (If none, enter zero and go on to Section D, Parents as Teachers for Their Own Children.)

_____ Number of ESAA *parent* volunteers who work within the school's educational program

3. Please indicate the number of ESAA volunteers *who work on an on-going basis within this school's educational program* belonging to each racial/ethnic group listed below. First, indicate the racial/ethnic backgrounds of *all* ESAA volunteers. Then, indicate the racial/ethnic backgrounds of ESAA *parent* volunteers.

Racial/Ethnic Background	ESAA volunteers	ESAA parent volunteers
American Indian or Alaskan Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, not of Hispanic origin		
Hispanic		
White, not of Hispanic origin		

4. How many hours of *formal training* (e.g., workshops, conferences, seminars, supervised on-the-job training) will the typical parent volunteer who works within the school's educational program receive during the 1978-79 school year as part of the ESAA project? (If none, enter zero.)

_____ Number of hours of formal training

5. Listed below are some of the activities in which an ESAA parent volunteer might engage. Please go through the list and mark with a check each of those activities in which ESAA parent volunteers at this school actually do engage. Then go back and indicate with the numbers 1 and 2 the two activities engaged in most frequently by these ESAA parent volunteers.

(a) _____ Relieving teachers of non-instructional duties or tasks (e.g., roll-taking, correcting papers)

(b) _____ Assisting in the acquisition, preparation or retrieval of instructional materials

(c) _____ Assisting in the operation or monitoring of classroom learning centers

(d) _____ Working with individual children or small groups, reviewing or reteaching skills and concepts they have already learned

(e) _____ Giving special assistance to children with particular academic difficulties or weaknesses

(f) _____ Enriching the curriculum in areas requiring special skills or unique experiences (e.g., activities and/or instruction related to minority cultural backgrounds)

(g) _____ Assisting in the teaching of new skills or concepts to the children

(h) _____ Assisting in the non-classroom components of the school program (e.g., library, playground, field trips)

(i) _____ Planning and/or participating in special activities with multi-cultural themes (e.g., assemblies, fiestas, carnivals)

(j) _____ Other (Please specify.) _____

6. Following are several possible methods for providing compensation to parents for expenses they incur while volunteering their time and services at a school. Please mark with a check each method that is used within the ESAA project at this school to defray the expenses incurred by parent volunteers. Then go back and indicate with the number 1 the method of compensation used most frequently.

(a) _____ Parent volunteers are provided with in-kind services (e.g., child care, babysitting).

(b) _____ Parent volunteers are reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses (e.g., transportation).

(c) _____ Parent volunteers receive stipends to defray all or part of the expenses they incur.

(d) _____ Other (Please specify.) _____

_____

(e) _____ No money or services are provided to defray expenses incurred by parent volunteers.

SECTION D.
PARENTS AS TEACHERS FOR THEIR OWN CHILDREN

The single question in this section is concerned with efforts of the school's ESAA project to involve parents in the educational process as teachers for their own children in the home.

1. Following are several activities and services that might be provided to parents who teach their own children at home as part of the ESAA project. Please go through the list and mark with a check each of the activities and services which has been provided by this school's ESAA project during the 1978-79 school year. (Mark all that apply.)

   (a) _____ Group training sessions (held, for example, at school, at the district office, in a parent's home)

   (b) _____ Workshops in which parents are assisted in making educational games and other instructional materials for use at home with their children

   (c) _____ Individual training sessions

   (d) _____ Specially prepared materials that are sent home for parents' use with their children

   (e) _____ Written handouts (e.g., pamphlets, handbooks) intended for individual home study

   (f) _____ Other (Please specify.) _____

   _____

   (g) _____ No activities or services are provided.

SECTION E.
COORDINATION/PROMOTION OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Questions in this section are concerned with the person or group of persons *at this school* who coordinates or promotes parental involvement activities. This person(s) might have responsibilities such as: informing parents about district or school activities or policies, serving as a mediator or arbitrator between parents and the district and/or school, or coordinating training or education programs for parents. In responding to this section, please *do not include* any person(s) who coordinates or promotes parental involvement activities at more than one school or is considered to be a district-level parental involvement specialist or coordinator. If there is no person at this school who is responsible for coordinating and/or promoting parental involvement activities, check the box below and go on to Section F, ESAA-funded Nonprofit Organizations.

☐ No person responsible for coordinating and/or promoting parental involvement activities

1. How many persons are there at this school who serve *full-time* to coordinate or promote parental involvement activities? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 5.)

   _____ Number of full-time parental involvement coordinators

2. How many of these full-time parental involvement coordinators spend time on activities related to parental involvement *within the ESAA project*? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 5.)

_____ Number of full-time parental involvement coordinators who spend time on ESAA parental involvement activities

3. Please estimate the *total* number of hours per week spent by these full-time parental involvement coordinators on activities related to parental involvement within the ESAA project.

_____ Hours per week spent on ESAA parental involvement activities

4. Do the parental involvement coordinators associated with the ESAA project at this school also serve any other federal program?

_____ No (Go on to Question 5.)

_____ Yes

a. If yes, indicate which of the following programs, in addition to ESAA, are served by these parental involvement coordinators.

_____ ESEA Title I

_____ ESEA Title VII Bilingual

_____ Follow Through

_____ Other (Please specify.) _____

You have just been answering questions about full-time parental involvement coordinators who spend at least some of their time on ESAA parental involvement activities. Questions 5 and 6 ask about persons who are *not full-time* parental involvement coordinators but whose *responsibilities nonetheless include* coordinating and/or promoting ESAA parental involvement activities.

5. How many persons are there at this school who are *not full-time* parental involvement coordinators but whose responsibilities include coordinating and/or promoting parental involvement activities associated with the ESAA project? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 7.)

_____ Number of persons who are not full-time parental involvement coordinators but whose responsibilities include coordinating and/or promoting ESAA parental involvement activities at this school

6. Please estimate the *total* number of hours per week spent by the persons indentified in Question 5 on activities related to parental involvement within the ESAA project.

_____ Hours per week spent on ESAA parental involvement activities

7. Listed below are some activities in which persons (whether working full-time or part-time) who are responsible for coordinating and/or promoting parental involvement activities might engage. Please go through the list and mark with a check each of those activities in which the person(s) responsible for coordinating and/or promoting parental involvement activities within this school's ESAA project actually engages. Then go back and indicate with the numbers *1* and *2* the two activities engaged in most frequently by this person(s).

(a) _____ Visit parents in their homes to inform them about district or school activities and policies

(b) _____ Participate in meetings to inform parents about district or school activities and policies

(c) _____ Conduct workshops to inform parents about the regulations and guidelines for the ESAA program

(d) _____ Serve as an advocate for parents before district, school and community

(e) _____ Serve as an advocate for the district and/or school to the parents

(f) _____ Serve as an arbitrator between parents and the district and/or school

(g) _____ Recruit parents for involvement in ESAA district or school activities (e.g., advisory committees, paid paraprofessional positions, volunteer positions, home tutors)

(h) _____ Help to organize and/or to run parent education programs

(i) _____ Coordinate training activities for parents (e.g., workshops, conferences, seminars)

(j) _____ Participate in in-service training intended to help school professional and/or paraprofessional staff deal with the special problems of minority group students

(k) _____ Help to plan special school activities with multicultural themes (e.g., assemblies, fiestas, carnivals)

(l) _____ Provide counsel for parents concerning school-related problems

(m) _____ Provide counsel for parents concerning family relationships

(n) _____ Help parents to locate services within the community (e.g., medical services, community mental health services, welfare)

(o) _____ Provide informal opportunities for parents and district and/or school personnel to interact

(p) _____ Other (Please specify.) _____

SECTION F.
ESAA-FUNDED NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

Questions in this section are concerned with ESAA-funded Nonprofit Organizations (NPOs) that provide services to this school or students enrolled in this school. If there are no ESAA-funded NPOs providing such services to this school, check the box below and go on to Section G, School Funding.

☐ No ESAA-funded NPOs

1. Please list all ESAA-funded NPOs that have provided services to this school or students enrolled in this school during the 1978-79 school year.

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. We are interested in identifying activities undertaken by these ESAA-funded NPOs for the purpose of involving parents of children enrolled *in this school* in the educational process or in any aspect of the ESAA project. We realize that because of the varied nature of ESAA-funded NPOs, there may be a wide range of such parental involvement activities offered to this school by NPOs. These activities might include (but are not limited to) educating parents about the school operation and/or federal, state, or locally funded educational programs; training parents to provide educational assistance for their own children; and involving parents in tutorial programs or guidance/counseling programs. In the space below, please list all parental involvement activities provided to this school by ESAA-funded NPOs. Please be as specific and detailed as possible. Then, go back and indicate with the numbers 1 and 2 the two parental involvement activities provided most frequently by these ESAA-funded NPOs.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

SECTION G.
SCHOOL FUNDING

Please answer the following questions about funding this school is receiving during the 1978-79 school year.

1. Is this school receiving the following types of funding for the 1978-79 school year? (Mark "yes" or "no" for each type of funding.)

YES	NO	
_____	_____	ESEA Title I
_____	_____	ESEA Title VII Bilingual
_____	_____	Follow Through
_____	_____	The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142)
_____	_____	Other Federal (excluding ESAA funding)
_____	_____	State (Categorical funds)

2. How many years (including 1978-79) has this school received ESAA funds?

_____ Number of years

3. Indicate the total amount of each type of ESAA funding that will be used to provide services for this school during the 1978-79 school year. (If no money is being received from a particular grant source, enter zero.)

$ _____ ESAA Basic
$ _____ ESAA Pilot
$ _____ ESAA Magnet
$ _____ ESAA (Total from *all* ESAA grants)

4. How many students will receive services supported by ESAA funds *at this school* during the 1978-79 school year? First, indicate the total number of *students enrolled in this school* who will receive services supported by ESAA funds. Then, indicate the total number of *non-public school students* who will receive ESAA services at this school.

_____ Number of students enrolled in this school who will receive ESAA services during the school year
_____ Number of non-public school students who will receive ESAA services at this school during the school year

You have now completed the formal portion of the questionnaire. The System Development Corporation person who will be calling to record your responses to these questions will also be anxious to talk with you about any other significant parental involvement activities that occur at this school as part of the ESAA project. *Please use the space below to jot down any comments that you would like to share with us* about the school's ESAA parental involvement activities.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

202

FEDAC Clearance No. S-9
Expiration date: 4/80

ESEA TITLE VII BILINGUAL PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

DISTRICT-LEVEL

As a vital part of the Study of Parental Involvement in Four Federal Education Programs, this questionnaire is designed to collect information related to ESEA Title VII Bilingual-supported parental involvement activities in your district. Although parental participation is considered a valued aspect of several federal educational programs including Title VII Bilingual, little is actually known about the nature and extent of such participation. The present study is being conducted by System Development Corporation (SDC) in direct response to a congressional request for systematic, descriptive information on parental involvement in major federal educational programs, and to similar requests by federal program offices. In addition, the results of the Study will be extremely helpful to local school people and parents who are attempting to promote parental involvement in their districts and schools. All responses to this questionnaire will be treated in accordance with federal privacy acts; results will not be reported in a form identifiable with any person, school, or district.

This questionnaire requests descriptive information about your district as well as information about two parental involvement program components. More specifically, it is organized into the following three sections:

SECTION A.	District Descriptive Information
SECTION B.	Supervision/Coordination of Parental Involvement Activities
SECTION C.	District-level Title VII Bilingual Community Advisory Committees

To answer some of the questions contained in these sections, you may need to consult with other personnel in the district office. We would appreciate your gathering the information needed to complete this questionnaire at your earliest convenience. A member of the study staff will be contacting you by telephone in the next few weeks to record your answers.

This study is sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education's Office of Evaluation and Dissemination. While you are not required to participate, your cooperation is needed to make the results of the study comprehensive, accurate, and timely.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

SECTION A.
DISTRICT DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

Please answer the following questions about your district. Many of these questions relate specifically to the district's ESEA Title VII Bilingual project. We understand that in some districts, an ESEA Title VII Bilingual project may have components or sub-projects for each of two or more languages, and that these components may, to some extent, be run as separate programs (with, for example, separate budgets and separate staffs). For the purposes of this questionnaire, please answer all items related to the Title VII Bilingual project about the *entire* project in your district. We realize that this approach may require you to consolidate information about several language components. However, the design of this study necessitates such project-level information.

If you are completing questionnaires for more than one federally funded program within your district, the first three items should be completed only once. If you have already answered these questions, go on to *Question 4* in Section A, District Descriptive Information.

1. What is your district's estimated 1978-79 *per pupil expenditure* for the elementary grades?

   $____

2. Indicate the total amount of each type of federal funding listed below that your district is receiving during the 1978-79 school year. (If no money is being received from a particular source, enter zero.)

   $____ Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title VII Bilingual
   $____ Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I
   $____ Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA)
   $____ Follow Through

3. Within your district, which, if any, of the following federal programs provide services to *non-public school students*? (Mark all that apply.)

   ____ Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title VII Bilingual
   ____ Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I
   ____ Elementary School Aid Act (ESAA)
   ____ Follow Through

4. Does the ESEA Title VII Bilingual budget for your *entire* district include a *line item* for parental involvement?

___ Yes

___ No (Go on to Section B, Supervision/Coordination of Parental Involvement Activities.)

a. If yes, please indicate the amount of the parental involvement line item for the 1978-79 school year.

$_____

b. If yes, what types of *services* and/or *activities* are supported within the parental involvement budget category (e.g., district-level Community Advisory Committee, school-level advisory committees, parental involvement specialist, school-parent liaison, paid parent para-professionals, parent volunteer program, home tutoring program)?

_____

_____

_____

SECTION B.
SUPERVISION/COORDINATION OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Questions in this section are concerned with the person or group of persons who might operate *at the district level* to supervise and/or coordinate parental involvement activities. This person(s) might have responsibilities such as: informing parents about district or school activities or policies, coordinating training or education programs for parents, or serving as a mediator or arbitrator between parents and the district and/or school. If there is a person or group of persons whose responsibilities include supervising and/or coordinating parental involvement activities at the school level *but who operates at more than one school*, please consider the person(s) to be a district-level staff person(s) and answer the questions in this section about that person(s). In responding to the questions that refer specifically to supervision and/or coordination of Title VII Bilingual parental involvement activities, please include *all* district-level persons whose responsibilities encompass supervising and/or coordinating such activities, *regardless of which language components they serve*. If there is no person in your district who is responsible for supervising and/or coordinating parental involvement activities, check the box below and go on to Section C, District-level Title VII Bilingual Community Advisory Committees.

☐ No person responsible for supervising and/or coordinating parental involvement activities

1. How many persons are there at the district level who serve as *full-time* parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 5.)

   ____ Number of full-time parental involvement specialists/parent coordinators

2. How many of these full-time, district-level parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators spend time on activities related to parental involvement *within the Title VII Bilingual program*? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 5.)

   ____ Number of full-time parental involvement specialists/parent coordinators who spend time on Title VII Bilingual parental involvement activities

3. Please estimate the *total* number of hours per week spent by these full-time parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators on activities related to parental involvement within the Title VII Bilingual program.

   ____ Hours per week spent on Title VII Bilingual parental involvement activities

4. Do the district-level parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators associated with the Title VII Bilingual program also serve any other federal program?

   ____ No (Go on to Question 5.)
   ____ Yes

   a. If yes, indicate which of the following programs, in addition to Title VII Bilingual, are served by these district-level parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators.

      ____ ESEA Title I
      ____ ESAA
      ____ Follow Through
      ____ Other (Please specify.) _____

You have just been answering questions about full-time parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators who spend at least some of their time on Title VII Bilingual parental involvement activities. Questions 5 and 6 ask about persons who are *not full-time* parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators but whose *responsibilities nonetheless include* supervising and/or coordinating Title VII Bilingual parental involvement activities.

5. How many persons are there at the district level who are *not full-time* parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators but whose responsibilities include supervising and/or coordinating parental involvement activities associated with the Title VII Bilingual program? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 7.)

   ____ Number of persons who are not full-time parental involvement specialists/coordinators but whose responsibilities include supervising and/or coordinating Title VII Bilingual parental involvement activities

6. Please estimate the *total* number of hours per week spent by the persons identified in Question 5 on activities related to parental involvement within the Title VII Bilingual program.

   ____ Hours per week spent on Title VII Bilingual parental involvement activities

7. Listed below are some activities in which persons (whether working full-time or part-time) who are responsible for supervising and/or coordinating parental involvement activities might engage. Please go through the list and mark with a check each of those activities in which the district-level person(s) responsible for coordinating and/or supervising parental involvement activities within the Title VII Bilingual program actually engages. Then go back and indicate with the numbers *1* and *2* the two activities engaged in most frequently by this person(s).

(a) ____ Coordinate visitations to parents to inform them about district or school activities or policies

(b) ____ Participate in meetings to inform parents about district or school activities or policies

(c) ____ Coordinate activities for parents to train them and/or inform them about regulations and guidelines for the Title VII Bilingual program (e.g., workshops, conferences, seminars)

(d) ____ Help to organize and/or to run programs to train parents in the use of bilingual educational techniques and methods

(e) ____ Coordinate a program to provide counsel for parents concerning family relationships

(f) ____ Recruit parents for involvement in Title VII Bilingual district or school activities (e.g., community advisory committees, paid paraprofessional positions, volunteer positions, home tutors)

(g) ____ Serve as an advocate for parents before district and school administration

(h) ____ Serve as an advocate for the district and/or school to the parents

(i) ____ Serve as an arbitrator between parents and district and/or school

(j) ____ Provide informal opportunities for parents and district and/or school personnel to interact

(k) ____ Translate materials (e.g., notices, handbooks) to be sent to parents

(l) ____ Other (Please specify.) _____

SECTION C.

DISTRICT-LEVEL TITLE VII BILINGUAL COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Questions in this section are concerned with district-level Community Advisory Committees which are associated with the management of Title VII Bilingual projects. These questions refer to advisory committees that represent a district's *entire* Title VII Bilingual project, rather than committees that represent only specific language components. If there is no such district-level committee for Title VII Bilingual in your district, check the box below.

☐ No District-level Title VII Bilingual Community Advisory Commitee
(This completes the formal portion of the questionnaire. Please turn to page 14.)

1. How many *voting* members are serving on your district's Title VII Bilingual Community Advisory Committee (CAC) during the 1978-79 school year?

   ____ Number of voting members

2. Indicate the number of *voting parent* members presently serving on the district Title VII Bilingual Community Advisory Committee (CAC) who belong to the following racial/ethnic groups.

   ____ American Indian or Alaskan Native
   ____ Asian or Pacific Islander
   ____ Black, not of Hispanic origin
   ____ Hispanic
   ____ White, not of Hispanic origin

   ____ Total number of voting parent members

3. How many of the voting members presently serving on the district Title VII Bilingual CAC are parents of children who are currently *receiving Title VII Bilingual services* in the district?

   ____ Number of voting members who are parents of children being served

4. For each category of district Title VII Bilingual CAC members listed below, please indicate 1) whether the members from this category are customarily *elected*, *appointed*, or *self-selected* (i.e., volunteers), *and* 2) whether the members customarily hold *voting* or *non-voting* memberships on the district CAC. (If a category of individuals is not represented on your district CAC, leave the spaces corresponding to that category blank.)

Categories (Roles) of Individuals	Elected (1)	Appointed (2)	Volunteer (3)	Voting (4)	Non-voting (5)
(a) Parents of students served by the Title VII Bilingual project					
(b) Parents of other students attending school in this district					
(c) Students					
(d) Professional school personnel					
(e) Paid Aides and Assistants					
(f) Representatives of non-public schools					
(g) Representatives of community organizations (e.g., civic, business, church)					

5. Is the entire *voting* membership of the district Title VII Bilingual CAC selected (e.g., elected, appointed, self-selected) at the same time?

(a) ____ Yes, all of the voting seats on the district CAC are filled at the same time and for the same terms of office.

(b) ____ No, terms of office are staggered so that all of the voting members are not selected at the same point in time.

(c) ____ There are no set terms of office for voting members of the district CAC.

6. Which of the following statements best describes the policy governing how long a member can serve on your district's Title VII Bilingual CAC? (Mark one.)

(a) _____ A member can serve on the district CAC for only *one* term of office.

(b) _____ A member can serve more than one term of office; however, these terms of office must be non-consecutive.

(c) _____ A member can serve on the district CAC for a prescribed number of consecutive terms of office.

(d) _____ A member can serve on the district CAC for an unrestricted number of consecutive terms of office or an unlimited amount of time.

7. Which of the following statements best describes the procedure customarily used to select Title VII Bilingual CAC officers? Please answer this question first for the CAC chairperson and then for all other CAC officers.

	Elected to the position(s) (1)	Appointed to the position(s) (2)	Volunteered for the position(s) (3)
CAC Chairperson			
Other CAC officers			

8. Please mark the statement which best describes the terms of office for Title VII Bilingual district CAC officers.

(a) _____ A district CAC officer can serve as an officer for only *one* term of office.

(b) _____ A district CAC officer can serve more than one term of office; however, these terms of office must be non-consecutive.

(c) _____ A district CAC officer can serve in his or her position for a prescribed number of consecutive terms of office.

(d) _____ A district CAC officer can serve as an officer for an unrestricted number of consecutive terms of office or an unlimited amount of time.

9. How many formal business meetings of the *entire* district Title VII Bilingual CAC will be held during the 1978-79 school year? (Include in your total the meetings which have already been held *plus* an estimate of the number of meetings which will be held between now and the end of the school year. Do *not* include workshops, training sessions or seminars held for CAC members.)

____ Total number of formal business meetings this school year

10. In what language(s) are the meetings of your district's Title VII Bilingual CAC typically held? (Mark all that apply.)

____ English
____ Spanish
____ Other (Please specify.) _____

11. Below are listed several activities often associated with the conduct of formal meetings of a Title VII Bilingual CAC. Please indicate, by checking the appropriate column, the person or group of persons who has *primary responsibility* for carrying out each activity on your district's CAC. If responsibility for a given activity is *shared equally* by two or more persons or groups, please check the appropriate columns for all persons or groups who share that responsibility.

	Title VII Bilingual Project Director (1)	Title VII Bilingual Parent Coordinator/ Parental Involvement Specialist (2)	CAC Chair-person (3)	Other CAC officer(s) (4)	Other CAC member(s) (5)	Other (Please specify Below.) (6)
(a) Preside at CAC meetings						
(b) Set CAC meeting agendas						
(c) Select CAC meeting sites						
(d) Select CAC meeting times						
(e) Review/approve CAC meeting minutes						

12. Below are listed some of the important management activities in which district Title VII Bilingual CACs may be engaged. Please indicate by checking the appropriate column the *level of authority* which your district CAC exercises with regard to each activity. (Mark only one column for each activity.)

Management Activities	CAC has no advisory or decision-making role and no responsibility or no opportunity for involvement. (1)	CAC advises the LEA in making decisions; LEA has sole decision-making responsibility. (2)	Decision-making responsibility is jointly shared by CAC and LEA. (3)	CAC has exclusive or principal decision-making authority. (4)
(a) Developing the Title VII Bilingual project application				
(b) Conducting district-wide needs assessment for the Title VII Bilingual project				
(c) Planning specific components of the Title VII Bilingual project				
(d) Establishing goals and objectives for Title VII Bilingual project components				
(e) Monitoring implementation of Title VII Bilingual project components				
(f) Evaluating the extent to which goals and objectives for various project components are being met				
(g) Reviewing Title VII Bilingual district budget allocations for parental involvement activities				
(h) Reviewing other Title VII Bilingual district budget allocations				
(i) Signing off on Title VII Bilingual district budget allocations for parental involvement activities				
(j) Signing off on other Title VII Bilingual district budget allocations				
(k) Establishing eligibility requirements for employing parents with Title VII Bilingual funds				
(l) Selecting Title VII Bilingual professional staff (e.g., teachers, math/reading specialists, media resource specialists)				
(m) Selecting Title VII Bilingual paraprofessional staff (e.g., classroom aides, teaching assistants, playground/lunchroom aides, clerical assistants)				
(n) Evaluating Title VII Bilingual professional staff				
(o) Evaluating Title VII Bilingual paraprofessional staff				
(p) Handling staff and community complaints				
(q) Other (Please specify.) _____ _____ _____				

13. Are there *subcommittees* of your district's Title VII Bilingual CAC which meet regularly for the purpose of handling certain aspects of CAC business? (Please consider an executive committee to be a subcommittee; do *not* consider an *ad hoc*, i.e., temporary, committee to be a subcommittee.)

____ Yes

____ No (Go on to Question 14.)

a. If yes, please indicate the number of subcommittees which have met regularly during the 1978-79 school year.

____ subcommittees have met regularly during the 1978-79 school year

b. If yes, what types of responsibilities have been delegated to these subcommittees (e.g., authority to decide upon CAC budget allocations, responsibility for monitoring or evaluating Title VII Bilingual program components)?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

14. Indicate the total amount of your district Title VII Bilingual CAC's *budget for operating expenses and activities* during the 1978-79 school year. (If none, enter zero.)

$_____

15. How much of the money referred to in Question 14 is funding over which the district Title VII Bilingual CAC has *direct control*? In other words, how much of this money can the district CAC use at its own *discretion*? (If none, enter zero.)

$_____

16. How many of the *voting* members presently serving on your *district's Title VII Bilingual CAC* also serve as voting members on district-level advisory groups for the following federal programs? (If none, enter zero.)

____ serve on an ESEA Title I district-level advisory group

____ serve on an ESAA district-level advisory group

____ serve on a Follow Through district-level advisory group

Although Title VII Bilingual advisory committees are mandated at only the district level, they are sometimes instituted at other levels as well. The last three questions in this section ask about the extent to which advisory committees associated with the Title VII Bilingual program exist beyond the district level.

17. Approximately what percentage of the schools in your district that receive Title VII Bilingual funds have school-level Title VII Bilingual advisory committees? (If no school-level Title VII Bilingual advisory committees exist in your district, check here and go on to Question 19 _____.)

    ____ % of the Title VII Bilingual-funded schools have school-level Title VII Bilingual advisory committees

18. How many of the *voting* members presently serving on your *district's* Title VII Bilingual CAC also serve as voting members on school-level Title VII Bilingual advisory committees? (If none, enter zero.)

    ____ serve on school-level Title VII Bilingual advisory committees

19. We are also interested in advisory committees, other than district-wide or school-level, which serve the Title VII Bilingual projects operating in your district or in schools within your district. Which, if any, of the following types of advisory committees serve the Title VII Bilingual program? (Mark all that apply.)

    ____ Regional (i.e., advisory committees that consist of members from more than one district within a state)

    ____ County

    ____ Intermediate (i.e., advisory committees that consist of more than one school within a district)

    ____ Other (Please specify.) _____

You have now completed the formal portion of this questionnaire. The System Development Corporation person who will be calling to record your responses to these questions will also be anxious to talk with you about any other significant parental involvement activities that occur at the district level as part of your Title VII Bilingual project. *Please use the space below to jot down any comments that you would like to share with us* about your district's Title VII Bilingual parental involvement activities.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

ESEA TITLE VII BILINGUAL PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

SCHOOL-LEVEL

As a vital part of the Study of Parental Involvement in Four Federal Education Programs, this questionnaire is designed to collect information related to ESEA Title VII Bilingual-supported parental involvement activities in your school. Although parental participation is considered a valued aspect of several federal educational programs including Title VII Bilingual, little is actually known about the nature and extent of such participation. The present study is being conducted by System Development Corporation (SDC) in direct response to a congressional request for systematic, descriptive information on parental participation in major federal educational programs, and to similar requests by federal program offices. In addition, the results of the Study will be extremely helpful to local school people and parents who are attempting to promote parental involvement in their districts and schools. All responses to this questionnaire will be treated in accordance with federal privacy acts; results will not be reported in a form identifiable with any person, school, or district.

This questionnaire requests descriptive information about the school identified above, as well as information about several parental involvement program components. More specifically, it is organized into the following six sections:

SECTION A.	School Descriptive Information
SECTION B.	Paid Paraprofessionals
SECTION C.	Volunteers
SECTION D.	Parents as Teachers for Their Own Children
SECTION E.	Coordination/Promotion of Parental Involvement Activities
SECTION F.	School Funding

To answer some of the questions contained in these sections, you may need to consult with personnel at the school. We would appreciate your gathering the information needed to complete this questionnaire at your earliest convenience. A member of the study staff will be contacting you by telephone in the next few weeks to record your answers.

This study is sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education's Office of Evaluation and Dissemination. While you are not required to participate, your cooperation is needed to make the results of the study comprehensive, accurate, and timely.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

SECTION A.
SCHOOL DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

Please answer the following questions about the school named on the front of this questionnaire. Many of these questions relate specifically to the school's ESEA Title VII Bilingual project. We understand that at some schools, an ESEA Title VII Bilingual project may have components or sub-projects for each of two or more languages, and that these components may, to some extent, be run as separate programs (with, for example, separate budgets and separate staffs). For the purposes of this questionnaire, please answer all items related to the Title VII Bilingual project about the *entire* project at this school. We realize that this approach may require you to consolidate information about several language components. However, the design of this study necessitates such project-level information.

If you are completing questionnaires for more than one federally funded program within the school, the first four items should be completed only once. If you have already answered these questions, go on to *Question 5* in Section A, School Descriptive Information.

1. As of October 1, 1978, indicate the number of students in this school enrolled in each of the grades listed below. (If this school does not contain a particular grade level, enter zero.)

____ Kindergarten	____ Grade 4	____ Grade 8
____ Grade 1	____ Grade 5	____ Grades 9-12
____ Grade 2	____ Grade 6	____ Other
____ Grade 3	____ Grade 7	____ Total Enrollment

2. What percentage of the students in this school are considered to be low-income students?

   ____ % of students

   a. What criterion did you use to estimate the above percentage of low-income students in the school (e.g., students eligible for free or reduced price lunch, students from families eligible for Aid to Families with Dependent Children)?

   _____

3. Please indicate your estimate of the percentage of students enrolled in this school who live with parents or guardians whose home language is not English.

   ____ % of students

4. Which of the following best describes the location of this school? (Mark one.)

(a) ____ Large city, over 200,000 population
(b) ____ Suburb of a large city
(c) ____ Middle-size city, 50,000 to 200,000 population
(d) ____ Suburb of a middle-size city
(e) ____ Small city or town, less than 50,000 population
(f) ____ Rural area near a large or middle-size city
(g) ____ Rural area, not near a large or middle-size city

5. Please indicate which *languages* are funded under the ESEA Title VII Bilingual project at this school for the 1978-79 school year. (Mark all that apply.)

(a) ____ Spanish
(b) ____ French
(c) ____ Chinese
(d) ____ Japanese
(e) ____ Other (Please specify.) _____

The following questions ask about school-level Title VII Bilingual advisory committees. Although such committees are not mandated at the school level, we are interested in whether or not one has been instituted at this school.

6. Is there a Title VII Bilingual advisory committee at this school?

(a) ____ Yes, there is *one* Title VII Bilingual advisory committee at this school.
(b) ____ Yes, there are *several* advisory committees at this school, each representing a *different language component* of the Title VII Bilingual project. (Go on to Section B, Paid Paraprofessionals.)
(c) ____ No, there is no Title VII Bilingual advisory committee at this school. (Go on to Section B, Paid Paraprofessionals.)

SECTION B.
PAID PARAPROFESSIONALS

Questions in this section are concerned with members of this school's paid paraprofessional staff whose salaries are paid primarily by Title VII Bilingual funds. If there are no such *Title VII Bilingual-funded paid paraprofessionals* at this school, check the box below and go on to Section C, Volunteers.

☐ No Title VII Bilingual-funded paid paraprofessionals

1. How many of the *paid paraprofessionals* currently employed at this school receive salaries paid primarily by Title VII Bilingual funds?

   ___ Number of Title VII Bilingual-funded paid paraprofessionals

2. How many of these Title VII Bilingual-funded paid paraprofessionals are *parents of children currently enrolled in this school*? (If none, enter zero and go on to Section C, Volunteers.)

   ___ Number of Title VII Bilingual-funded paid *parent* paraprofessionals

3. How many of these Title VII Bilingual-funded paid paraprofessionals are *parents of children who are currently being served* by the Title VII Bilingual project at this school? (If none, enter zero.)

   ___ Number of Title VII Bilingual-funded paid paraprofessionals who are parents of children being served

Questions 4 through 7 apply only to Title VII Bilingual-funded paid paraprofessionals who are *parents of children currently enrolled* in this school. These persons need *not* be parents of Title VII Bilingual children.

4. Listed below are some of the activities in which a paid paraprofessional might engage. Please go through the list and mark with a check each of those activities in which the Title VII Bilingual-funded paid parent paraprofessionals at this school actually do engage. Then go back and indicate with the numbers 1 and 2 the two activities engaged in most frequently by the Title VII Bilingual-funded paid parent paraprofessional staff.

   (a) ____ Relieving teachers of non-instructional duties or tasks (e.g., roll-taking, correcting papers)

   (b) ____ Assisting in the acquisition, preparation or retrieval of bilingual instructional materials

   (c) ____ Assisting in the operating or monitoring of classroom learning centers

   (d) ____ Working with individual children or small groups on activities designed to improve their English-speaking abilities

   (e) ____ Working with individual children or small groups, reviewing or reteaching skills and concepts they have already learned

   (f) ____ Giving special assistance to children with exceptional talents or difficulties (other than difficulties with the English language)

   (g) ____ Enriching the curriculum in areas requiring special skills or unique experiences (e.g., bi-cultural activities)

   (h) ____ Assisting in the teaching of new skills or concepts to the children

   (i) ____ Assisting in the non-classroom components of the school program (e.g., library, playground, field trips)

   (j) ____ Other (Please specify.) _____

7. For each category of school Title VII Bilingual advisory committee members listed below, please indicate 1) whether the members from this category are customarily *elected*, *appointed*, or *self-selected* (i.e., volunteers), *and* 2) whether the members customarily hold *voting* or *non-voting* memberships on the school advisory committee. (If a category of individuals is not represented on the school advisory committee, leave the spaces corresponding to that category blank.)

Categories (Roles) of Individuals	Elected (1)	Appointed (2)	Volunteer (3)	Voting (4)	Non-voting (5)
(a) Parents of students served by the Title VII Bilingual project					
(b) Parents of other students attending the school					
(c) Students					
(d) Professional school personnel					
(e) Paid Aides and Assistants					
(f) Representatives of non-public schools					
(g) Representatives of community organizations (e.g., civic, business, church)					

5. In the columns below are listed several activities related to the hiring of Title VII Bilingual-funded paid parent paraprofessionals. Please indicate, by checking the appropriate row, who has *primary* responsibility for carrying out each activity at this school.

	Setting of selection criteria (1)	Nomination of candidates (2)	Interviewing of candidates (3)	Final selection of paid parent paraprofessionals (4)
(a) School principal				
(b) Teacher or other school-level professional staff				
(c) Paid paraprofessional staff				
(d) Title VII Bilingual Community Advisory Committee				
(e) Special hiring committee that includes parent members				
(f) Special hiring committee that does not include parent members				
(g) District personnel officer or other district administrative staff				
(h) Other (Please specify.) _____				

You have just been answering questions about all of the parent paraprofessionals in this school whose salaries are paid primarily by Title VII Bilingual funds. Questions 6 and 7 are concerned only with the parent paraprofessionals paid with Title VII Bilingual funds who *work directly with children as part of the instructional process*. (If none of the Title VII Bilingual-funded paid parent paraprofessionals works directly with children as part of the instructional process, check here and go on to Section C, Volunteers. _____)

6. What percentage of the Title VII Bilingual-funded parent paraprofessionals who started this school year *working directly with children* as part of the instructional process, have remained on staff at this school?

_____ % of those who started the school year remain on staff

7. How many hours of *formal training* (e.g., workshops, conferences, seminars, supervised on-the-job training) will the typical paid parent paraprofessional who works directly with children as part of the instructional process be provided during the 1978-79 school year through the Bilingual project? First, indicate the number of hours of formal training in the use of *bilingual* educational techniques and methods. Then, indicate the number of hours of formal training not specifically focused on bilingual education. (If none, enter zero.)

___ Number of hours of training in the use of bilingual educational techniques and methods

___ Number of hours of other formal training

SECTION C.
VOLUNTEERS

Questions in this section are concerned with the volunteer component of the Title VII Bilingual program. More specifically, we are interested in those Title VII Bilingual volunteers who work within the school's educational program. If there are no such *Title VII Bilingual volunteers* at this school, check the box below and go on to Section D, Parents as Teachers for Their Own Children.

☐ No Title VII Bilingual volunteers who work within the school's educational program

1. Please estimate the number of volunteers who work within this school's educational program on an on-going basis as part of the Title VII Bilingual project.

___ Number of Title VII Bilingual volunteers who work within the school's educational program

2. How many of these Title VII Bilingual-supported volunteers are *parents of children currently enrolled in this school*? (If none, enter zero and go on to Section D, Parents as Teachers for Their Own Children.)

___ Number of Title VII Bilingual *parent* volunteers who work within the school's educational program

3. How many hours of *formal training* (e.g., workshops, conferences, seminars, supervised on-the-job training) will the typical parent volunteer who works within the school's educational program receive during the 1978-79 school year as part of the Bilingual project? First, indicate the number of hours of formal training in the use of *bilingual* educational techniques and methods. Then, indicate the number of hours of formal training not specifically focused on bilingual education. (If none, enter zero.)

____ Number of hours of training in the use of bilingual educational techniques and methods

____ Number of hours of other formal training

4. Listed below are some of the activities in which a Title VII Bilingual parent volunteer might engage. Please go through the list and mark with a check each of those activities in which Title VII Bilingual parent volunteers at this school actually do engage. Then go back and indicate with the numbers *1* and *2* the two activities engaged in most frequently by these Title VII Bilingual parent volunteers.

(a) ____ Relieving teachers of non-instructional duties or tasks (e.g., roll-taking, correcting papers)

(b) ____ Assisting in the acquisition, preparation or retrieval of *bilingual* instructional materials

(c) ____ Assisting in the operation or monitoring of classroom learning centers

(d) ____ Working with individual children or small groups on activities designed to improve their English-speaking abilities

(e) ____ Working with individual children or small groups, reviewing or reteaching skills and concepts they have already learned

(f) ____ Giving special assistance to children with exceptional talents or difficulties (other than difficulties with the English language)

(g) ____ Enriching the curriculum in areas requiring special skills or unique experiences (e.g., bicultural activities)

(h) ____ Assisting in the teaching of new skills or concepts to the children

(i) ____ Assisting in the non-classroom components of the school program (e.g., library, playground, field trips)

(j) ____ Other (Please specify.) _____

5. Following are several possible methods for providing compensation to parents for expenses they incur while volunteering their time and services at a school. Please mark with a check each method that is used within the Title VII Bilingual project at this school to defray the expenses incurred by parent volunteers. Then go back and indicate with the number *1* the method of compensation used most frequently.

(a) ____ Parent volunteers are provided with in-kind services (e.g., child care, babysitting).

(b) ____ Parent volunteers are reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses (e.g., transportation).

(c) ____ Parent volunteers receive stipends to defray all or part of the expenses they incur.

(d) ____ Other (Please specify.) _____

_____

(e) ____ No money or services are provided to defray expenses incurred by parent volunteers.

SECTION D.
PARENTS AS TEACHERS FOR THEIR OWN CHILDREN

The single question in this section is concerned with efforts of the school's Title VII Bilingual project to involve parents in the educational process as teachers for their own children in the home.

1. Following are several activities and services that might be provided to parents who teach their own children at home as part of the Title VII Bilingual project. Please go through the list and mark with a check each of the activities and services which has been provided by this school's Title VII Bilingual project during the 1978-79 school year. (Mark all that apply.)

   (a) ____ Group training sessions (held, for example, at school, at the district office, in a parent's home)

   (b) ____ Workshops in which parents are assisted in making educational games and other instructional materials for use at home with their children

   (c) ____ Individual training sessions

   (d) ____ Specially prepared materials that are sent home for parents' use with their children

   (e) ____ Written handouts (e.g., pamphlets, handbooks) intended for individual home study

   (f) ____ Other (Please specify.)_____

   _____

   (g) ____ No activities or services are provided.

SECTION E.
COORDINATION/PROMOTION OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Questions in this section are concerned with the person or group of persons *at this school* who coordinates or promotes parental involvement activities. This person(s) might have responsibilities such as: informing parents about district or school activities or policies, serving as a mediator or arbitrator between parents and the district and/or school, or coordinating training or education programs for parents. In responding to this section, please *do not include* any person(s) who coordinates or promotes parental involvement activities at more than one school or is considered to be a district-level parental involvement specialist or coordinator. If there is no person at this school who is responsible for coordinating and/or promoting parental involvement activities, check the box below and go on to Section F, School Funding.

☐ No person responsible for coordinating and/or promoting parental involvement activities

1. How many persons are there at this school who serve *full-time* to coordinate or promote parental involvement activities? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 5.)

   ____ Number of full-time parental involvement coordinators

2. How many of these full-time parental involvement coordinators spend time on activities related to parental involvement *within the Title VII Bilingual project*? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 5.)

   ____ Number of full-time parental involvement coordinators who spend time on Title VII Bilingual parental involvement activities

3. Please estimate the *total* number of hours per week spent by these full-time parental involvement coordinators on activities related to parental involvement within the Title VII Bilingual project.

   ____ Hours per week spent on Title VII Bilingual parental involvement activities

4. Do the parental involvement coordinators associated with the Title VII Bilingual project at this school also serve any other federal program?

   ____ No (Go on to Question 5.)
   ____ Yes

   a. If yes, indicate which of the following programs, in addition to Title VII Bilingual, are served by these parental involvement coordinators.

      ____ ESEA Title I
      ____ ESAA
      ____ Follow Through
      ____ Other (Please specify.) _____

You have just been answering questions about full-time parental involvement coordinators who spend at least some of their time on Title VII Bilingual parental involvement activities. Questions 5 and 6 ask about persons who are *not full-time* parental involvement coordinators but whose *responsibilities nonetheless include* coordinating and/or promoting Title VII Bilingual parental involvement activities.

5. How many persons are there at this school who are *not full-time* parental involvement coordinators but whose responsibilities include coordinating and/or promoting parental involvement activities associated with the Title VII Bilingual project? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 7.)

   ____ Number of persons who are not full-time parental involvement coordinators but whose responsibilities include coordinating and/or promoting Title VII Bilingual parental involvement activities at this school

6. Please estimate the *total* number of hours per week spent by the persons identified in Question 5 on activities related to parental involvement within the Title VII Bilingual project.

   ____ Hours per week spent on Title VII Bilingual parental involvement activities

7. Listed below are some activities in which persons (whether working full-time or part-time) who are responsible for coordinating and/or promoting parental involvement activities might engage. Please go through the list and mark with a check each of those activities in which the person(s) responsible for coordinating and/or promoting parental involvement activities within this school's Title VII Bilingual project actually engages. Then go back and indicate with the numbers 1 and 2 the two activities engaged in most frequently by this person(s).

   (a) ____ Visit parents in their homes to inform them about district or school activities and policies
   (b) ____ Participate in meetings to inform parents about district or school activities and policies
   (c) ____ Conduct workshops to inform parents about the regulations and guidelines for the Title VII Bilingual program
   (d) ____ Serve as an advocate for parents before district, school and community
   (e) ____ Serve as an advocate for the district and/or school to the parents
   (f) ____ Serve as an arbitrator between parents and the district and/or school
   (g) ____ Recruit parents for involvement in Title VII Bilingual district or school activities (e.g., community advisory committees, paid paraprofessional positions, volunteer positions, home tutors)
   (h) ____ Help to organize and/or to run programs to train parents in the use of bilingual educational techniques and methods
   (i) ____ Coordinate training activities for parents (e.g., workshops, conferences, seminars)
   (j) ____ Provide counsel for parents concerning school-related problems
   (k) ____ Provide counsel for parents concerning family relationships
   (l) ____ Help parents to locate services within the community (e.g., medical services, community mental health services, welfare)
   (m) ____ Provide informal opportunities for parents and district and/or school personnel to interact
   (n) ____ Translate materials (e.g., notices, handbooks) to be sent to parents
   (o) ____ Other (Please specify.) _____

SECTION F.
SCHOOL FUNDING

Please answer the following questions about funding this school is receiving during the 1978-79 school year.

1. Is this school receiving the following types of funding for the 1978-79 school year? (Mark "yes" or "no" for each type of funding).

YES	*NO*	
____	____	ESEA Title I
____	____	ESAA
____	____	Follow Through
____	____	The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142)
____	____	Other Federal (excluding Title VII Bilingual funding)
____	____	State (Categorical funds)

2. How many years (including 1978-79) has this school received Title VII Bilingual funds?

____ Number of years

3. Indicate the total amount of Title VII Bilingual funds that will be used to provide services for this school during the 1978-79 school year.

$____

4. How many students will receive services supported by Title VII Bilingual funds *at this school* during the 1978-79 school year? First, indicate the total number of *students enrolled in this school* who will receive services supported by Title VII Bilingual funds. Then, indicate the total number of *non-public school students* who will receive Title VII Bilingual services at this school.

____ Number of students enrolled in this school who will receive Bilingual services during the school year

____ Number of non-public school students who will receive Bilingual services at this school during the school year

You have now completed the formal portion of the questionnaire. The System Development Corporation person who will be calling to record your responses to these questions will also be anxious to talk with you about any other significant parental involvement activities that occur at this school as part of the Title VII Bilingual project. *Please use the space below to jot down any comments that you would like to share with us* about this school's Title VII Bilingual parental involvement activities.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

FEDAC Clearance No. S-9
Expiration date: 4/80

FOLLOW THROUGH PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

SCHOOL-LEVEL

As a vital part of the Study of Parental Involvement in Four Federal Education Programs, this questionnaire is designed to collect information related to the Follow Through project's parental involvement activities operating at your school. Although parental participation is considered a valued aspect of several federal educational programs including Follow Through, little is actually known about the nature and extent of such participation. The present study is being conducted by System Development Corporation (SDC) in direct response to a congressional request for systematic, descriptive information on parental participation in major federal educational programs, and to similar requests by federal program offices. In addition, the results of the Study will be extremely helpful to local school people and parents who are attempting to promote parental involvement in their districts and schools. All responses to this questionnaire will be treated in accordance with federal privacy acts; results will not be reported in a form identifiable with any person, school, or district.

This questionnaire requests descriptive information about the school identified above, as well as information about several parental involvement program components. More specifically, it is organized into the following six sections:

SECTION A. School Descriptive Information
SECTION B. Paid Paraprofessionals
SECTION C. Volunteers
SECTION D. Parents as Teachers for Their Own Children
SECTION E. Coordination/Promotion of Parental Involvement Activities
SECTION F. School Funding

To answer some of the questions contained in these sections, you may need to consult with personnel at the school. We would appreciate your gathering the information needed to complete this questionnaire at your earliest convenience. A member of the study staff will be contacting you by telephone in the next few weeks to record your answers.

This study is sponsored by the U. S. Office of Education's Office of Evaluation and Dissemination. While you are not required to participate, your cooperation is needed to make the results of the study comprehensive, accurate, and timely.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

SECTION A.
SCHOOL DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

Please answer the following questions about the school named on the front of this questionnaire. If you are completing questionnaires for more than one federally funded program within the school, the first four items should be completed only once. If you have already answered these questions, go on to *Question 5* in Section A, School Descriptive Information.

1. As of October 1, 1978, indicate the number of students in this school enrolled in each of the grades listed below. (If this school does not contain a particular grade level, enter zero.)

_____ Kindergarten	_____ Grade 4	_____ Grade 8
_____ Grade 1	_____ Grade 5	_____ Grades 9-12
_____ Grade 2	_____ Grade 6	_____ Other
_____ Grade 3	_____ Grade 7	_____ Total Enrollment

2. What percentage of the students in this school are considered to be low-income students?

_____ % of students

a. What criterion did you use to estimate the above percentage of low-income students in the school (e.g., students eligible for free or reduced price lunch, students from families eligible for Aid to Families with Dependent Children)?

_____

_____

3. Please indicate your estimate of the percentage of students enrolled in this school who live with parents or guardians whose home language is not English.

_____ % of students

4. Which of the following best describes the location of this school? (Mark one.)

(a) _____ Large city, over 200,000 population
(b) _____ Suburb of a large city
(c) _____ Middle-size city, 50,000 to 200,000 population
(d) _____ Suburb of a middle-size city
(e) _____ Small city or town, less than 50,000 population
(f) _____ Rural area near a large or middle-size city
(g) _____ Rural area, not near a large or middle-size city

The following questions ask about school-level Follow Through advisory committees. Although such committees are not mandated at the school level, we are interested in whether or not one has been instituted at this school.

5. Is there a Follow Through advisory committee at this school?

_____ No (Go on to Section B, Paid Paraprofessionals.)
_____ Yes

6. For each category of school advisory committee members listed below, please indicate 1) whether the members from this category are customarily *elected*, *appointed*, or *self-selected* (i.e., volunteers), *and* 2) whether the members customarily hold *voting* or *non-voting* memberships on the school advisory committee. (If a category of individuals is not represented on the school advisory committee, leave the spaces corresponding to that category blank.)

Categories (Roles) of Individuals	Elected (1)	Appointed (2)	Volunteer (3)	Voting (4)	Non-voting (5)
(a) Parents of students served by the Follow Through project					
(b) Parents of other students currently enrolled in the school					
(c) Students					
(d) Professional school personnel					
(e) Paid Aides and Assistants					
(f) Representatives of non-public schools					
(g) Representatives of community organizations (e.g., civic, business, church)					

SECTION B.
PAID PARAPROFESSIONALS

Questions in this section are concerned with members of this school's paid paraprofessional staff whose salaries are paid primarily by Follow Through funds. If there are no such *Follow Through-funded paid paraprofessionals* at this school, check the box below and go on to Section C, Volunteers.

☐ No Follow Through-funded paid paraprofessionals

1. How many of the *paid paraprofessionals* currently employed at this school receive salaries paid primarily by Follow Through funds?

_____ Number of Follow Through-funded paid paraprofessionals

2. How many of these Follow Through-funded paid paraprofessionals are *parents of children currently enrolled in this school*? (If none, enter zero and go on to Section C, Volunteers.)

_____ Number of Follow Through-funded paid *parent* paraprofessionals

3. How many of these Follow Through-funded paid paraprofessionals are *parents of children currently being served* by the Follow Through project at this school? (If none, enter zero.)

_____ Number of Follow Through-funded paid paraprofessionals who are parents of children being served

Questions 4 through 7 apply only to Follow Through-funded paid paraprofessionals who are *parents of children currently enrolled* in this school. These persons need *not* be parents of Follow Through children.

4. Listed below are some of the activities in which a paid paraprofessional might engage. Please go through the list and mark with a check each of those activities in which the Follow Through-funded paid parent paraprofessionals at this school actually do engage. Then go back and indicate with the number 1 and 2 the two activities engaged in most frequently by the Follow Through-funded paid parent paraprofessional staff.

(a) _____ Relieving teachers of non-instructional duties or tasks (e.g., roll-taking, correcting papers)

(b) _____ Assisting in the acquisition, preparation or retrieval of instructional materials

(c) _____ Assisting in the operating or monitoring of classroom learning centers

(d) _____ Working with individual children or small groups, reviewing or reteaching skills and concepts they have already learned

(e) _____ Giving special assistance to children with particular academic difficulties or weaknesses

(f) _____ Enriching the curriculum in areas requiring special skills or unique experiences

(g) _____ Assisting in the planning and carrying out of learning activities based on the children's own interests, needs and capabilities

(h) _____ Assisting in the teaching of new skills or concepts to the children

(i) _____ Assisting in the non-classroom components of the school program (e.g., library, playground, field trips)

(j) _____ Other (Please specify.) _____

5. In the columns below are listed several activities related to the hiring of Follow Through-funded paid parent paraprofessionals. Please indicate, by checking the appropriate row, who has *primary* responsibility for carrying out each activity at this school.

	Setting of selection criteria (1)	Nomination of candidates (2)	Interviewing of candidates (3)	Final selection of paid parent paraprofessionals (4)
(a) School principal				
(b) Teacher or other school-level professional staff				
(c) Paid paraprofessional staff				
(d) Follow Through Policy Advisory Committee				
(e) Special hiring committee that includes parent members				
(f) Special hiring committee that does not include parent members				
(g) District personnel officer or other district administrative staff				
(h) Other (Please specify.)_____ _____				

You have just been answering questions about all of the parent paraprofessionals in this school whose salaries are paid primarily by Follow Through funds. Questions 6 and 7 are concerned only with the parent paraprofessionals paid with Follow Through funds who *work directly with children as part of the instructional process.* (If none of the Follow Through-funded paid parent paraprofessionals works directly with children as part of the instructional process, check here and go on to Section C, Volunteers. _____)

6. What percentage of the Follow Through-funded parent paraprofessionals who started this school year *working directly with children* as part of the instructional process have remained on staff at this school?

_____ % of those who started the school year remain on staff

7. How many hours of *formal training* (e.g., workshops, conferences, seminars, supervised on-the-job training) will the typical paid parent paraprofessional who works directly with children as part of the instructional process be provided during the 1978-79 school year through the Follow Through project? (If none, enter zero.)

_____ Number of hours of formal training

SECTION C.
VOLUNTEERS

Questions in this section are concerned with the volunteer component of the Follow Through project. More specifically, we are interested in those Follow Through volunteers who work within the school's educational program. If there are no such *Follow Through volunteers* at this school, check the box below and go on to Section D, Parents as Teachers for Their Own Children.

☐ No Follow Through volunteers who work within the school's educational program

1. Please estimate the number of volunteers who work within this school's educational program on an on-going basis as part of the Follow Through project.

_____ Number of Follow Through volunteers who work within the school's educational program

2. How many of these Follow Through-supported volunteers are *parents of children currently enrolled in this school*? (If none, enter zero and go on to Section D, Parents as Teachers for Their Own Children.)

_____ Number of Follow Through *parent* volunteers who work within the school's educational program

3. How many hours of *formal training* (e.g., workshops, conferences, seminars, supervised on-the-job training) will the typical parent volunteer who works within the school's educational program receive during the 1978-79 school year as part of the Follow Through project? (If none, enter zero.)

_____ Number of hours of formal training

4. Listed below are some of the activities in which a Follow Through parent volunteer might engage. Please go through the list and mark with a check each of those activities in which Follow Through parent volunteers at this school actually do engage. Then go back and indicate with the numbers 1 and 2 the two activities engaged in most frequently by these Follow Through parent volunteers.

(a) _____ Relieving teachers of non-instructional duties or tasks (e.g., roll-taking, correcting papers)

(b) _____ Assisting in the acquisition, preparation or retrieval of instructional materials

(c) _____ Assisting in the operation or monitoring of classroom learning centers

(d) _____ Working with individual children or small groups, reviewing or reteaching skills and concepts they have already learned

(e) _____ Giving special assistance to children with particular academic difficulties or weaknesses

(f) _____ Enriching the curriculum in areas requiring special skills or unique experiences

(g) _____ Assisting in the planning and carrying out of learning activities based on the children's own interests, needs and capabilities

(h) _____ Assisting in the teaching of new skills or concepts to the children

(i) _____ Assisting in the non-classroom components of the school program (e.g., library, playground, field trips)

(j) _____ Other (Please specify.) _____

5. Following are several possible methods for providing compensation to parents for expenses they incur while volunteering their time and services at a school. Please mark with a check each method that is used within the Follow Through project at this school to defray the expenses incurred by parent volunteers. Then go back and indicate with the number 1 the method of compensation used most frequently.

(a) _____ Parent volunteers are provided with in-kind services (e.g., child care, babysitting).

(b) _____ Parent volunteers are reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses (e.g., transportation).

(c) _____ Parent volunteers receive stipends to defray all or part of the expenses they incur.

(d) _____ Other (Please specify.) _____

_____

(e) _____ No money or services are provided to defray expenses incurred by parent volunteers.

SECTION D.
PARENTS AS TEACHERS FOR THEIR OWN CHILDREN

The single question in this section is concerned with efforts of the school's Follow Through project to involve parents in the educational process as teachers for their own children in the home.

1. Following are several activities and services that might be provided to parents who teach their own children at home as part of the Follow Through project. Please go through the list and mark with a check each of the activities and services which has been provided by this school's Follow Through project during the 1978-79 school year. (Mark all that apply.)

(a) _____ Group training sessions (held, for example, at school, at the district office, or in a parent's home)

(b) _____ Workshops in which parents are assisted in making educational games and other instructional materials for use at home with their children

(c) _____ Individual training sessions

(d) _____ Specially prepared materials that are sent home for parents' use with their children

(e) _____ Written handouts (e.g., pamphlets, handbooks) intended for individual home study

(f) _____ Other (Please specify.) _____

_____

(g) _____ No activities or services are provided.

SECTION E.
COORDINATION/PROMOTION OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Questions in this section are concerned with the person or group of persons *at this school* who coordinates or promotes parental involvement activities. This person(s) might have responsibilities such as: informing parents about district or school activities or policies, serving as a mediator or arbitrator between parents and the district and/or school, or coordinating training or education programs for parents. In responding to this section, please *do not include* any person(s) who coordinates or promotes parental involvement activities at more than one school or is considered to be a district-level parental involvement specialist or coordinator. If there is no person at this school who is responsible for coordinating and/or promoting parental involvement activities, check the box below and go on to Section F, School Funding.

☐ No person responsible for coordinating and/or promoting parental involvement activities

1. How many persons are there at this school who serve *full time* to coordinate or promote parental involvement activities? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 5.)

   _____ Number of full-time parental involvement coordinators

2. How many of these full-time parental involvement coordinators spend time on activities related to parental involvement *within the Follow Through project*? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 5.)

   _____ Number of full-time parental involvement coordinators who spend time on Follow Through parental involvement activities

3. Please estimate the *total* number of hours per week spent by these full-time parental involvement coordinators on activities related to parental involvement within the Follow Through project.

   _____ Hours per week spent on Follow Through parental involvement activities

4. Do the parental involvement coordinators associated with the Follow Through project at this school also serve any other federal program?

   ____ No (Go on to Question 5.)

   _____ Yes

   a. If yes, indicate which of the following programs, in addition to Follow Through, are served by these parental involvement coordinators.

      _____ ESEA Title VII Bilingual

      _____ ESAA

      _____ ESEA Title I

      _____ Other (Please specify.) _____

You have just been answering questions about full-time parental involvement coordinators who spend at least some of their time on Follow Through parental involvement activities. Questions 5 and 6 ask about persons who are *not full-time* parental involvement coordinators but whose *responsibilities nonetheless include* coordinating and/or promoting Follow Through parental involvement activities.

5. How many persons are there at this school who are *not full-time* parental involvement coordinators but whose responsibilities include coordinating and/or promoting parental involvement activities associated with the Follow Through project? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 7.)

_____ Number of persons who are not full-time parental involvement coordinators but whose responsibilities include coordinating and/or promoting Follow Through parental involvement activities at this school

6. Please estimate the *total* number of hours per week spent by the persons identified in Question 5 on activities related to parental involvement within the Follow Through project.

_____ Hours per week spent on Follow Through parental involvement activities

7. Listed below are some activities in which persons (whether working full-time or part-time) who are responsible for coordinating and/or promoting parental involvement activities might engage. Please go through the list and mark with a check each of those activities in which the person(s) responsible for coordinating and/or promoting parental involvement activities within this school's Follow Through project actually engages. Then go back and indicate with the numbers *1* and *2* the two activities engaged in most frequently by this person(s).

(a) _____ Visit parents in their homes to inform them about district or school activities and policies

(b) _____ Participate in meetings to inform parents about district or school activities and policies

(c) _____ Conduct workshops to inform parents about the regulations and guidelines for the Follow Through program and/or to familiarize them with the Follow Through model

(d) _____ Serve as an advocate for parents before district, school and community

(e) _____ Serve as an advocate for the project, district or school to the parents

(f) _____ Recruit parents for involvement in Follow Through project activities (e.g., policy advisory committees, paid paraprofessional positions, volunteer positions, home tutors)

(g) _____ Help to organize and/or to run parent education programs

(h) _____ Coordinate training activities for parents (e.g., workshops, conferences, seminars)

(i) _____ Provide counsel for parents concerning school-related problems

(j) _____ Provide counsel for parents concerning family relationships

(k) _____ Help to run the career development program for Follow Through parents

(l) _____ Help to run the support services program for Follow Through parents

(m) _____ Provide informal opportunities for parents and school personnel to interact

(n) _____ Other (Please specify.) _____

SECTION F.
SCHOOL FUNDING

Please answer the following questions about funding this school is receiving during the 1978-79 school year.

1. Is this school receiving the following types of funding for the 1978-79 school year? (Mark "yes" or "no" for each type of funding.)

YES	NO	
_____	_____	ESEA Title I
_____	_____	ESEA Title VII Bilingual
_____	_____	ESAA
_____	_____	The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142)
_____	_____	Other Federal (excluding Follow Through funding)
_____	_____	State (Categorical funds)

2. How many years (including 1978-79) has this school received Follow Through funds?

_____ Number of years

3. Indicate the total amount of Follow Through funds that will be used to provide services for this school during the 1978-79 school year.

$_____

4. How many students will receive services supported by Follow Through funds *at this school* during the 1978-79 school year? First indicate the total number of *students enrolled in this school* who will receive services supported by Follow Through funds. Then indicate the total number of *non-public school students* who will receive Follow Through services at this school.

_____ Number of students enrolled in this school who will receive Follow Through services during the school year

_____ Number of non-public school students who will receive Follow Through services at this school during the school year

You have now completed the formal portion of the questionnaire. The System Development Corporation person who will be calling to record your responses to these questions will also be anxious to talk with you about any other significant parental involvement activities that occur at this school as part of the Follow Through project. *Please use the space below to jot down any comments that you would like to share with us* about this school's Follow Through parental involvement activities.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

FEDAC Clearance No. S-9
Expiration date: 4/80

FOLLOW THROUGH PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

PROJECT-LEVEL

As a vital part of the Study of Parental Involvement in Four Federal Education Programs, this questionnaire is designed to collect information related to parental involvement activities within your Follow Through project. Although parental participation is considered a valued aspect of several federal educational programs including Follow Through, little is actually known about the nature and extent of such participation. The present study is being conducted by System Development Corporation (SDC) in direct response to a congressional request for systematic, descriptive information on parental involvement in major federal educational programs, and to similar requests by federal program offices. In addition, the results of the Study will be extremely helpful to local school people and parents who are attempting to promote parental involvement in their districts and schools. All responses to this questionnaire will be treated in accordance with federal privacy acts; results will not be reported in a form identifiable with any person, school or district.

This questionnaire requests descriptive information about your district as well as information about two parental involvement program components. More specifically, it is organized into the following three sections:

SECTION A. District Descriptive Information
SECTION B. Supervision/Coordination of Parental Involvement Activities
SECTION C. Project-level Follow Through Policy Advisory Committees

To answer some of the questions contained in these sections, you may need to consult with other personnel in the project office and with people in the district office. We would appreciate your gathering the information needed to complete this questionnaire at your earliest convenience. A member of the study staff will be contacting you by telephone in the next few weeks to record your answers.

This study is sponsored by the U. S. Office of Education's Office of Evaluation and Dissemination. While you are not required to participate, your cooperation is needed to make the results of the study comprehensive, accurate, and timely.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

SECTION A.
DISTRICT DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

Please answer the following questions about the district in which your Follow Through project operates. If you are completing questionnaires for more than one federally funded program within the district, the first three items should be completed only once. If you have already answered these questions, go on to *Question 4* in Section A, District Descriptive Information.

1. What is your district's estimated 1978-79 *per pupil expenditure* for the elementary grades?

   $ _____

2. Indicate the total amount of each type of federal funding listed below that the district is receiving during the 1978-79 school year. (If no money is being received from a particular source, enter zero.)

   $ _____ Follow Through
   $ _____ Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I
   $ _____ Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA)
   $ _____ Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title VII Bilingual

3. Within the district, which, if any, of the following federal programs provide services to *non-public school students?* (Mark all that apply.)

   _____ Follow Through
   _____ Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I
   _____ Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA)
   _____ Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title VII Bilingual

4. Does your project's Follow Through budget include a *line item* for parental involvement?

   _____ Yes
   _____ No (Go on to Section B, Supervision/Coordination of Parental Involvement Activities.)

   a. If yes, please indicate the amount of the parental involvement line item for the 1978-79 school year.

      $ _____

   b. If yes, what types of services and/or activities are supported within the parental involvement budget category (e.g., project-level Policy Advisory Committee, school-level advisory committees, parental involvement specialist, school-parent liaison, paid parent paraprofessionals, parent volunteer program, home tutoring program)?

      _____
      _____
      _____
      _____

SECTION B.
SUPERVISION/COORDINATION OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Questions in this section are concerned with the person or group of persons who might operate *at the district level* to supervise and/or coordinate parental involvement activities. This person(s) might have responsibilities such as: informing parents about district or school activities or policies, coordinating training or education programs for parents, or serving as a mediator or arbitrator between parents and the district and/or school. If there is a person or group of persons whose responsibilities include supervising and/or coordinating parental involvement activities at the school level *but who operates at more than one school*, please consider the person(s) to be a district-level staff person(s) and answer the questions in this section about that person(s). If there is no person in your district who is responsible for supervising and/or coordinating parental involvement activities, check the box below and go on to Section C, Project-level Follow Through Policy Advisory Committees.

☐ No person responsible for supervising and/or coordinating parental involvement activities

1. How many persons are there at the district level who serve as *full-time* parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 5.)

   _____ Number of full-time parental involvement specialists/parent coordinators

2. How many of these full-time parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators spend time on activities related to parental involvement *within the Follow Through project?* (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 5.)

   _____ Number of full-time parental involvement specialists/parent coordinators who spend time on Follow Through parental involvement activities

3. Please estimate the *total* number of hours per week spent by these full-time parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators on activities related to parental involvement within the Follow Through project.

   _____ Hours per week spent on Follow Through parental involvement activities

4. Do the district-level parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators associated with the Follow Through project also serve any other federal program?

   _____ No (Go on to Question 5.)

   _____ Yes

   a. If yes, indicate which of the following programs, in addition to Follow Through, are served by these district-level parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators.

      _____ ESEA Title I

      _____ ESEA Title VII Bilingual

      _____ ESAA

      _____ Other (Please specify.)_____

You have just been answering questions about full-time parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators who spend at least some of their time on Follow Through parental involvement activities. Questions 5 and 6 ask about persons who are *not full-time* parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators but whose *responsibilities nonetheless include* supervising and/or coordinating Follow Through parental involvement activities.

5. How many persons are there at the district level who are *not full-time* parental involvement specialists or parent coordinators but whose responsibilities include supervising and/or coordinating parental involvement activities associated with the Follow Through project? (If none, enter zero and go on to Question 7.)

   _____ Number of persons who are not full-time parental involvement specialists/coordinators but whose responsibilities include supervising and/or coordinating Follow Through parental involvement activities

6. Please estimate the *total* number of hours per week spent by the persons identified in Question 5 on activities related to parental involvement within the Follow Through project.

   _____ Hours per week spent on Follow Through parental involvement activities

7. Listed below are some activities in which persons (whether working full-time or part-time) who are responsible for supervising and/or coordinating parental involvement activities might engage. Please go through the list and mark with a check each of those activities in which the district-level person(s) responsible for coordinating and/or supervising parental involvement activities within the Follow Through project actually engages. Then go back and indicate with the numbers 1 and 2 the two activities engaged in most frequently by this person(s).

   (a) _____ Coordinate visitations to parents to inform them about district or school activities or policies

   (b) _____ Participate in meetings to inform parents about district or school activities or policies

   (c) _____ Coordinate activities for parents to train them and/or inform them about regulations and guidelines for the Follow Through program (e. g., workshops, conferences, seminars)

   (d) _____ Help to organize and/or to run parent education programs

   (e) _____ Coordinate a program to provide counsel for parents concerning family relationships

   (f) _____ Help to organize and/or to run the career development program for Follow Through parents

   (g) _____ Help to organize and/or to run the support services program for Follow Through parents

   (h) _____ Recruit parents for involvement in Follow Through project activities (e. g., policy advisory committees, paid paraprofessional positions, volunteer positions, home tutors)

   (i) _____ Serve as an advocate for parents before district and school administration

   (j) _____ Serve as an advocate for the project, district and/or school to the parents

   (k) _____ Serve as an arbitrator between parents and the district and/or school

   (l) _____ Provide informal opportunities for parents and school personnel to interact

   (m) _____ Other (Please specify.) _____

SECTION C.
PROJECT-LEVEL FOLLOW THROUGH POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Questions in this section are concerned with project-level Policy Advisory Committees (PACs) which are associated with the management of Follow Through projects. If there is no such Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) for your Follow Through project, check the box below.

☐ No Project-level Policy Advisory Committee (This completes the formal portion of the questionnaire. Please turn to page 11.)

1. How many *voting* members are serving on your project's Follow Through Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) during the 1978-79 school year?

   _____ Number of voting members

2. Indicate the number of *voting parent* members presently serving on the project Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) who belong to the following racial/ethnic groups.

   _____ American Indian or Alaskan Native
   _____ Asian or Pacific Islander
   _____ Black, not of Hispanic origin
   _____ Hispanic
   _____ White, not of Hispanic origin

   _____ Total number of voting parent members

3. How many of the voting members presently serving on the project PAC are parents of children who are currently *receiving Follow Through services* within the project?

   _____ Number of voting members who are parents of children being served

4. For each category of Follow Through PAC members listed below, please indicate 1) whether the members from this category are customarily *elected*, *appointed*, or *self-selected* (i. e., volunteers), *and* 2) whether the members customarily hold *voting* or *non-voting* memberships on the project PAC. (If a category of individuals is not represented on your project's PAC, leave the spaces corresponding to that category blank.)

Categories (Roles) of Individuals	Elected (1)	Appointed (2)	Volunteer (3)	Voting (4)	Non-voting (5)
(a) Parents of students served by the Follow Through project					
(b) Parents of other students attending a school in the Follow Through project					
(c) Students					
(d) Professional school personnel					
(e) Paid Aides and Assistants					
(f) Representatives of non-public schools					
(g) Representatives of community organizations (e. g., civic, business, church)					

5. Is the entire *voting* membership of the project PAC selected (e. g., elected, appointed, self-selected) at the same time?

(a) _____ Yes, all of the voting seats on the project PAC are filled at the same time and for the same terms of office.

(b) _____ No, terms of office are staggered so that all of the voting members are not selected at the same point in time.

(c) _____ There are no set terms of office for voting members of the project PAC.

6. Which of the following statements best describes the policy governing how long a member can serve on your project's PAC? (Mark one.)

(a) _____ A member can serve on the project PAC for only *one* term of office.

(b) _____ A member can serve more than one term of office; however, these terms of office must be non-consecutive.

(c) _____ A member can serve on the project PAC for a prescribed number of consecutive terms of office.

(d) _____ A member can serve on the project PAC for an unrestricted number of consecutive terms of office or an unlimited amount of time.

7. Which of the following statements best describes the procedure customarily used to select Follow Through PAC officers? Please answer this question first for the PAC chairperson and then for all other PAC officers.

	Elected to the position(s) (1)	Appointed to the position(s) (2)	Volunteered for the position(s) (3)
PAC Chairperson			
Other PAC Officers			

8. Please mark the statement which best describes the terms of office for Follow Through project PAC officers.

(a) _____ A project PAC officer can serve as an officer for only *one* term of office.

(b) _____ A project PAC officer can serve more than one term of office; however, these terms of office must be nonconsecutive.

(c) _____ A project PAC officer can serve in his or her position for a prescribed number of consecutive terms of office.

(d) _____ A project PAC officer can serve as an officer for an unrestricted number of consecutive terms of office or an unlimited amount of time.

9. How many formal business meetings of the *entire* project PAC will be held during the 1978-79 school year? (Include in your total the meetings which have already been held *plus* an estimate of the number of meetings which will be held between now and the end of the school year. Do *not* include workshops, training sessions or seminars held for PAC members.)

_____ Total number of formal business meetings this school year

10. Below are listed several activities often associated with the conduct of formal meetings of a project PAC. Please indicate, by checking the appropriate column, the person or group of persons who has *primary responsibility* for carrying out each activity on your project's PAC. If responsibility for a given activity is *shared equally* by two or more persons or groups, please check the appropriate columns for all persons or groups who share that responsibility.

	Follow Through Project Director (1)	Follow Through Parent Coordinator/ Parental Involvement Specialist (2)	PAC Chair-person (3)	Other PAC Officer(s) (4)	Other PAC Member(s) (5)	Other (Please specify below.) (6)
(a) Preside at PAC meetings						
(b) Set PAC meeting agendas						
(c) Select PAC meeting sites						
(d Select PAC meeting times						
(e) Review/approve PAC meeting minutes						

11. Below are listed some of the important management activities in which project PACs may be engaged. Please indicate by checking the appropriate column the *level of authority* which your project PAC exercises with regard to each activity. (Mark only one column for each activity.)

Management Activities	PAC has no advisory or decision-making role and no responsibility or no opportunity for involvement. (1)	PAC advises the LEA in making decisions; LEA has sole decision-making responsibility. (2)	Decision-making responsibility is jointly shared by PAC and LEA. (3)	PAC has exclusive or principal decision-making authority. (4)
(a) Developing the Follow Through project application				
(b) Planning specific components of the Follow Through Project				
(c) Establishing goals and objectives for Follow Through project components				
(d) Monitoring implementation of Follow Through project components				
(e) Evaluating the extent to which goals and objectives for various project components are being met				
(f) Reviewing Follow Through project budget allocations for parental involvement activities				
(g) Reviewing other Follow Through project budget allocations				
(h) Signing off on Follow Through project budget allocations for parental involvement activities				
(i) Signing off on other Follow Through project budget allocations				
(j) Establishing eligibility requirements for employing parents with Follow Through funds				
(k) Selecting Follow Through professional staff (e. g., teachers, math/reading specialists, media resource specialists)				
(l) Selecting Follow Through paraprofessional staff (e. g., classroom aides, teaching assistants, playground/ lunchroom aides, clerical assistants)				
(m) Evaluating Follow Through professional staff				
(n) Evaluating Follow Through paraprofessional staff				
(o) Handling staff and community complaints				
(p) Other (Please specify.) _____ _____				

12. Are there *subcommittees* of your project's PAC which meet regularly for the purpose of handling certain aspects of PAC business? (Please consider an executive committee to be a subcommittee; do *not* consider an *ad hoc*, i. e., temporary, committee to be a subcommittee.)

_____ Yes

_____ No (Go on to Question 13.)

a. If yes, please indicate the number of subcommittees which have met regularly during the 1978-79 school year.

_____ subcommittees have met regularly during the 1978-79 school year

b. If yes, what types of responsibilities have been delegated to these subcommittees (e. g., authority to decide upon PAC budget allocations, responsibility for monitoring or evaluating Follow Through project components)?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. Indicate the total amount of your project PAC's *budget for operating expenses and activities* during the 1978-79 school year. (If none, enter zero.)

$ _____

14. How much of the money referred to in Question 13 is funding over which the project PAC has *direct control*? In other words, how much of this money can the project PAC use at its own *discretion*? (If none, enter zero.)

$ _____

15. How many of the *voting* members presently serving on your *project's Follow Through PAC* also serve as voting members on district-level advisory groups for the following federal programs? (If none, enter zero.)

_____ serve on an ESEA Title I district-level advisory group

_____ serve on an ESEA Title VII Bilingual district-level advisory group

_____ serve on an ESAA district-level advisory group

Although Follow Through advisory committees are mandated at only the project-level, they are sometimes instituted at other levels as well. The last three questions in this section ask about the extent to which advisory committees associated with the Follow Through program exist beyond the project level.

16. Approximately what percentage of the schools in your Follow Through project have advisory committees? (If no school-level Follow Through advisory committees exist in your project, check here and go on to Question 18. _____.)

    _____ % of the Follow Through schools have school-level Follow Through advisory committees

17. How many of the *voting* members presently serving on your *project-level* PAC also serve as voting members on school-level Follow Through advisory committees?

    _____ serve on school-level Follow Through advisory committees

18. We are also interested in advisory committees, other than project-level or school-level, which serve your Follow Through project or schools within your project. Which, if any, of the following types of advisory committees serve your Follow Through project? (Mark all that apply.)

    _____ Regional (i. e., advisory committees that consist of members from more than one district within a state)

    _____ County

    _____ Intermediate (i.e., advisory committees that consist of members from more than one school within a district)

    _____ Other (Please specify.) _____

You have now completed the formal portion of this questionnaire. The System Development Corporation person who will be calling to record your responses to these questions will also be anxious to talk with you about any other significant parental involvement activities that occur at the project level as part of the Follow Through program. *Please use the space below to jot down any comments that you would like to share with us* about your project's Follow Through parental involvement activities.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!